

# AGENDA ITEM 3

## PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT CONTROL) COMMITTEE – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2015

### 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
<a href="#">82164</a>	Davenport Green Hall, Shay Lane, Hale Barns, WA15 8UD	Hale Barns	1		
<a href="#">83507</a>	Southbank & Delamer Lodge, 1-2 Cavendish Road, Altrincham, WA14 2NJ	Bowdon	12		✓
<a href="#">84566</a>	Priory Nursery, 159 Dane Road, Sale, M33 2NG	Priory	26		
<a href="#">84644</a>	63 Woodhouse Road, Davyhulme, M41 7NT	Davyhulme West	33		
<a href="#">84968</a>	Mitford Lodge, 90 Mitford Street, Stretford, M32 8AQ	Stretford	38		✓
<a href="#">84979</a>	Mitford Lodge, 90 Mitford Street, Stretford, M32 8AQ	Stretford	51		✓
<a href="#">85007</a>	Land between Grosvenor House & 11A Goose Green, Back Grafton Street, Altrincham, WA14 1DW	Altrincham	65		✓
<a href="#">85049</a>	1-20 The Green, Whitley Gardens, Timperley, WA15 6XE	Village	80		
<a href="#">85149</a>	7 Riddings Road, Hale, WA15 9DS	Hale Central	87	✓	✓

<a href="#">85167</a>	226 Washway Road, Sale, M33 4RA	St Mary's	99	✓	✓
<a href="#">85620</a>	253 Washway Road, Sale, M33 4BL	Brooklands	109	✓	
<a href="#">85931</a>	190-192 Flixton Road, Flixton, M41 5DR	Urmston	118		

**Page 1 82164/COU/2014: Davenport Green Hall, Shay Lane, Hale Barns**

**RECOMMENDATION**

Condition 3 – Only one event to be held in within Davenport Green Hall (the White Room or the Historic Room) on any given day and not on the same day that an event is taking place within the Cheshire Barn or in any marquee erected on site.

**Page 12 83507/FULL/2014: Southbank & Delamer Lodge, 1-2 Cavendish Road, Altrincham**

**SPEAKER(S)**

**AGAINST:**

**FOR:**

**Don Murphy  
(Agent)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

Condition 9 (No estate agent boards) to be deleted.

**Page 26 84566/FUL/15: Priory Nursery, 159 Dane Road, Sale**

**CONSULTATIONS**

A consultation response received from Greater Manchester Police Design for Security is in support of the application for the retention of 2.4m high paladin mesh fencing. The reasons for supporting the application are as follows:

- Palisade fencing of the type and height erected is not uncommon around sports and recreation facilities in and around the urban fringe/green belt.
- It is not considered that the fence unreasonably encloses the footpath nor does it result in the creation of an overtly hostile environment for users of Cow Lane; as such its presence does not materially diminish the safety (actual or perceived) of the footpath for its users.
- The fence gives the perimeter an instantly solid, secure boundary that vegetation does not. In the medium to long term however, vegetation will grow and will disguise/hide the fence and enclose the pathway. This natural and

man-made boundary solution is typical of many footpaths in the urban fringe, where there is a need to balance security with amenity.

- A fence of 2000mm in height, of any form of construction, including that which might attract graffiti or be easily damaged, would constitute permitted development. Therefore, whilst the applicant does seek consent for a slightly higher fence, they do so with and understanding of the need to balance site security with visual amenity in selecting a suitable fence type, and of a height that is not overly oppressive.

**Page 38 84968/FUL/15: Mitford Lodge, 90 Mitford Street, Stretford**

**SPEAKER(S)**

**AGAINST:**

**FOR:**

**Nick Howard  
(Agent)**

**OBSERVATIONS**

The application currently proposes that bin storage for the retail units will take place within those units. This may not be acceptable in terms of any retail use that includes the sale of food. It is therefore recommended that a condition is attached that requires the submission of a management plan for the storage of refuse in relation to the retail units. This may result in refuse being stored outside any retail premises selling food. However, the previous reason for refusal relating to bin storage has been overcome in respect of the residential units and would not be a problem in respect of a non-food retail use and it is considered that external refuse storage solely in respect of a food retail unit would not be so detrimental to visual amenity as to justify refusal of the application.

**RECOMMENDATION**

10. Submission and implementation of management plan for storage of refuse in relation to the retail units.

**Page 51 84979/FUL/15: Mitford Lodge, 90 Mitford Street, Stretford**

**SPEAKER(S)**

**AGAINST:**

**FOR:**

**Nick Howard  
(Agent)**

**OBSERVATIONS**

The application currently proposes that bin storage for the retail units will take place within those units. This may not be acceptable in terms of any retail use that includes the sale of food. It is therefore recommended that a condition is

attached that requires the submission of a management plan for the storage of refuse in relation to the retail units. This may result in refuse being stored outside any retail premises selling food. However, the previous reason for refusal relating to bin storage has been overcome in respect of the residential units and would not be a problem in respect of a non-food retail use and it is considered that external refuse storage solely in respect of a food retail unit would not be so detrimental to visual amenity as to justify refusal of the application.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

10. Submission and implementation of management plan for storage of refuse in relation to the retail units.

**Page 65 85007/FUL/15: Land between Grosvenor House & 11A Goose Green, Back Grafton Street, Altrincham**

**SPEAKER(S)**

**AGAINST:**

**FOR:**

**Don Murphy  
(Agent)**

### **CONSULTATIONS**

**Asset Management (now Amey)** – Comment that the updated viability appraisal does show an affordable housing provision would make the scheme unviable. Recommend that any permission is subject to a legal agreement with an ‘overage’ clause to cover the scenario where the developer’s return may be better than predicted in the appraisal. This would not provide any affordable units on this site but could provide a commuted sum to contribute towards affordable housing provision elsewhere.

**Pollution and Licensing** – No objections subject to appropriate sound insulation measures being implemented to protect the occupants of the development from external noise sources. The submitted acoustic report confirms that noise mitigation and insulation measures are required to be installed in the development. To ensure that the internal noise climate is acceptable sound insulation performance specifications for the various building envelope elements are specified in the report and it is important that these are fully implemented. If the final building design differs significantly from the proposals in the report, calculations will need to be revised to ensure acoustic targets are not compromised. The applicant should confirm in writing to the LPA that the sound insulation measures are implemented to verify that the acoustic targets are met.

**Altrincham Town Centre Business Neighbourhood Forum** (further comments following re-consultation on the amended plans) - The Working Group of the Forum is supportive of this application. It should kick start the regeneration of Back Grafton Street as well as providing additional residential accommodation in the town centre. Very positive.

### **OBSERVATIONS**

The updated viability appraisal has been assessed by Amey and based on the predicted costs and values it is accepted that affordable housing provision within the scheme would make the scheme unviable. There is therefore no requirement for any permission to be subject to a legal agreement to secure affordable housing within the scheme.

With regards to the recommendation for an 'overage' clause, whilst there are reasonable grounds for this to be required it is also acknowledged that 'overage' may not be justified for a development of this kind and on this scale. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) at paragraph 17 states that viability assessment in decision-taking should be based on current costs and values and planning applications should be considered in today's circumstances. The only exception to this is where a scheme requires a phased delivery over the medium and longer term and changes in the value of development and changes in costs of delivery may be considered. RICS guidance on re-appraisals also states a re-appraisal is generally suited to phased schemes over the longer term rather than a single phase scheme to be implemented immediately and which requires certainty. It is clear that this proposed development would be a single phase scheme and the applicant has indicated their intention is to commence development as soon as possible. Given the above it is considered an 'overage' clause would not be supported by national guidance.

The requirement for sound insulation measures as recommended by Pollution and Licensing is covered by Condition 7 as recommended in the report.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Amend from MINDED TO GRANT SUBJECT TO LEGAL AGREEMENT to GRANT subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

**Page 80 85049/FUL/15: 1-20 The Green, Whitley Gardens, Timperley**

### **APPLICANTS SUBMISSION**

Trafford Housing Trust have confirmed that there is no specific system of allocating the parking spaces to the residents; appropriate signage would be erected within the application site clearly indicating that the parking spaces are for private use of the residents of 1-20 The Green only.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Condition 7 – Tree Protection

**Page 87 85149/FUL/15: 7 Riddings Road, Hale**

<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	<b>Bernadette Finnerty (Neighbour)</b>
	<b>FOR:</b>	<b>Holly Kirk (Applicant)</b>

## **OBSERVATIONS**

The applicant has confirmed that the proposed new dwelling would be 132mm (0.132m) higher than the existing dwelling, currently on site (this was previously noted within the case officer report, paragraph 5 as being the same height as the existing). This increase however is considered to be marginal and therefore is not considered to result in any additional harm to neighbouring dwellings; it is further considered that the increase would not impact adversely on the character of the wider street scene.

Delete paragraph 24 and replace with the following:

The Councils locally adopted SPD 4 Householder extension guidelines suggest a 15m separation distance would normally be required where a blank two storey wall of a proposed dwelling faces a main habitable room window. However the SPD suggests that there may be exceptions to this guideline and that every application should be considered on its own individual merits, by having regard to the relationship with the affected window as well as its orientation. In this case the main aspect of number 9 Riddings Road remains to its front and rear elevations and although the property does contain a bay window opening relating to a main habitable room within its western side elevation, which also has a small rear facing pane; in these circumstances it is considered unreasonable to apply the 15m distance rule to this relationship. It is therefore considered that in this instance the 12m distance being retained between the two properties is considered to be acceptable. The proposed relationship between the two properties is further considered to only be marginally worse than that allowed at appeal and therefore is considered acceptable.

## **RECOMMENDATION: GRANT**

Delete condition 9 and replace with following:

- Removal of Permitted Development Rights to insert windows within garages eastern side elevation

**Page 99 85167/FUL/15: 226 Washway Road, Sale**

**SPEAKER(S)**

**AGAINST:**

**Tony Casey  
(Neighbour)**

**FOR:**

**Ben Eckersley  
(Applicant)**

**REPRESENTATIONS**

A further e-mail has been received from a neighbouring resident who has previously made a representation which has been reported in the main officer's report. This email reiterates their objections to the proposal. The reasons for objection include overdevelopment of the site and danger and traffic congestion to the vehicular access onto Washway Road. It states this section of Washway Road is already extremely congested, meters away from the traffic lights and a bus stop and it is not felt this has been addressed by the Highway Team in assessing the proposal.

It goes on to state 'the existing exit at Harboro Road and Cecil Avenue junction has extremely poor visibility so to increase traffic movement at this 30° turn would add chaos to an area which often becomes a bottle neck at school times with the intensity affecting the traffic to and fro from the veterinary practise on the opposite corner. The impact this has to ourselves means that vehicles that get stuck at this 30° turn often have to reverse into our car park. Seeing and being seen are fundamental pre-requisites for the safety of all road users the increased risk of road crashes at this point of exit will become a serious problem. We have three young grandchildren regularly at this property who are vulnerable already without further exacerbating the situation.'

Finally it states 'overdevelopment has a huge impact on the environment with negative consequences to the social realm and human rights.'

**Page 109 85620/VAR/15: 253 Washway Road, Sale**

**SPEAKER(S)**

**AGAINST:**

**Roy Jolley  
(Neighbour)**

**FOR:**

**CONSULTATIONS**

**LHA -**

The LHA has received several complaints from nearby residents concerning problems caused by on street parking generated in part from the current operation of the application site. As a result, the LHA has undertaken to

introduce a scheme of waiting restrictions in nearby streets to mitigate the existing problems. Funding restrictions mean that the scheme is unlikely to be progressed by the LHA in the immediate future.

Any extension of opening hours at the site will exacerbate the existing problems, however, considering that the proposed extension of business hours are relatively minor, i.e. ½ hour on weekday mornings for “Servicing” and ½ hour in the afternoons at weekends for “Sales”, the LHA do not object to the proposed variation.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that Condition 17 is re-worded as follows: -

17. The sales premises shall not be open for customers (to the public) outside the following hours: -

08:30 – 19.00 Mondays to Fridays  
08:30 – 17:30 Saturdays and  
10:30 – 17:00 Sundays.

The servicing premises shall not be open for customers (to the public) outside the following hours: -

08:00 – 17:00 Mondays to Fridays  
08:30 – 13:00 Saturdays  
and shall be closed on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

**MRS. HELEN JONES  
DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT:  
Rob Haslam, Head of Planning Services  
Planning Department, 1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford,  
M32 0TH  
Telephone 0161 912 3149**