

# Public Document Pack



**TRAFFORD**  
**COUNCIL**

## **AGENDA PAPERS FOR PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**Date: Thursday, 12 May 2016**

**Time: 6.30 pm**

**Place: Committee Suite, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, Manchester  
M32 0TH**

### **AGENDA**

### **ITEM**

#### **3. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT**

To consider the attached report of the Head of Planning and Development, tabled at the meeting.

**3**

#### **THERESA GRANT**

Chief Executive

#### Membership of the Committee

Councillors Mrs. V. Ward (Chairman), D. Bunting (Vice-Chairman), Dr. K. Barclay, N. Evans, T. Fishwick, P. Gratrix, D. Hopps, E. Malik, D. O'Sullivan, Mrs J. Reilly, J. Smith, L. Walsh and M. Whetton

#### Further Information

For help, advice and information about this meeting please contact:

Michelle Cody, Democratic & Scrutiny Officer

Tel: 0161 912 2775

Email: [michelle.cody@trafford.gov.uk](mailto:michelle.cody@trafford.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 3

## AGENDA ITEM 3

PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT CONTROL) COMMITTEE – 12<sup>th</sup> May 2016

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 RECOMMENDATION	For REC.
<a href="#">86854</a>	59 Northenden Road, Sale, M33 2DG	Sale Moor	1		
<a href="#">87573</a>	Urmston Grammar School, Newton Road, Urmston, M41 5UG	Urmston	10		
<a href="#">87720</a>	24 Sunnybank Road, Bowdon, WA14 3PW	Bowdon	17	✓	✓
<a href="#">87733</a>	Bowfell House, 104 Bowfell Road, Urmston, M41 5RR	Flixton	24		
<a href="#">87818</a>	13 Campbell Road, Sale, M33 4AP	Brooklands	38	✓	✓
<a href="#">87954</a>	11 - 13 School Road, Sale, M33 7XY	Priory	44		✓

Page 1 86854/HHA/15: 59 Northenden Road, Sale

**Recommendation:**

1. Condition 2 - Remove “unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority”.

<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	<b>Paul Wright (Neighbour)</b>
	<b>FOR:</b>	<b>Emma Roden (Agent)</b>

### **CONSULTATIONS**

**Public Health** - Public Health are supportive of this proposal in principle. They advise they would be interested in the quality of the care that was going to be provided in the home, as well as making sure that physical layout, decoration and design of the home were in line with good practice both for dementia care and for people with co-morbidities (including sensory loss, mobility difficulties and general frailty). Public Health would look for the home to be able to manage people's care in such a way that hospital admissions were averted, for example.

**Pollution and Licensing (Nuisance)** - The site is adjacent to a small AQ Management Area covering the junction however the impacts of air quality (and noise) are not likely to be significant and warranting any additional mitigation over standard glazing treatments.

### **OBSERVATIONS**

#### RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

#### **Paragraph 11 Amended**

There are no residential properties on Bowfell Road immediately opposite the site. The closest residential properties to the Bowfell Road elevation of the proposed development would be the rear elevations of the existing properties on Flixton Road. These properties would be located over 50m from the proposed building and therefore it is considered the proposal would have an acceptable impact here.

#### **RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions**

#### **Condition 2 amended**

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plan, numbers AL (01)\_906 A; AL (01) 901 A; AL (01) 003 A; AL (9) 902 A; AL (01) 900 A; AL (01) 001 A; AL (01) 002 A; AL (01) 904 A; AL (01) 004 A; AL (01) 040 A and AL (01) 041 A.

Reason: To clarify the permission, having regard to Policies L1, L2, L4, L7 and L8 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework

**Condition 3 amended**

3. The premises to which this permission relates shall be used as a residential care home for both the elderly and those in need of dementia care with a maximum of 40 bedrooms and for no other purpose (including any other purpose within Class C2 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

Reason: Other uses within the same Use Class may have a detrimental effect on the neighbourhood and the restriction to the use proposed will enable the Local Planning Authority to consider any further change of use on its merits, having regard to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy.

**Condition 13 amended**

13. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until details of crime prevention measures outlined in the submitted Design and Access Statement Rev A dated 19th February 2016 and Supporting Information Email from Howard P. Clayton titled FW: 87733/FUL/16 - Bowfell House, 104 Bowfell Road, Urmston, have been implemented in full. The measures identified shall be retained and maintained at all times thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity having regard to Policy L7 of the Trafford Council.

**Page 38 87818/HHA/16: 13 Campbell Road, Sale**

<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	<b>Ken Garner (Neighbour)</b>
	<b>FOR:</b>	<b>David Hunter (Applicant)</b>

Attached is the correct site location plan.

**PROPOSAL**

For clarification in the first paragraph it should read ‘garage-**style** doors’.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

For clarification in paragraph 4 there are four not three proposed high-level, obscure glazed windows. Condition 4 relates to all four windows.

**Page 44 87954/FUL/16: 11 - 13 School Road, Sale**

<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	
	<b>FOR:</b>	<b>Neil McKie (Applicant)</b>

## **Consultations**

Lead Local Flood Authority – No objection

## **Representations**

3 further letters have been received from; the Headteacher of Springfield Primary School, the owner and the tenant of no.9 Springfield Road (office to rear of application site) on the additional following grounds:-

- Too close to a busy junction with a busy pedestrian crossing,
- Taking away this land will increase the threat to the safety of pupils especially as there is no crossing patrol supervision
- Distraction to drivers as they negotiate this busy junction and therefore possible safety issues,
- Already heavy pedestrian and traffic chaos at end of school day,
- Will expose the children to the effects of smoking, drinking and unsavoury language
- The property to the rear (no.9) is occupied by a charity – concerns that the raised decking would be near that property and the potential noise nuisance would not be conducive to their work,
- Increased litter,
- Query regarding the ownership of the land

## **Observations**

The above comments have been addressed in the Committee Report. With regard to the ownership of the land – this has been confirmed by Estates and Valuation as being within the ownership of Trafford Council.

## **Impact on Heritage Assets**

The Council has a statutory duty under Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have 'special regard' to the desirability of preserving the setting of a listed building when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which would affect that setting.

Policy R1 of the Core Strategy states that all new development must take account of surrounding building styles, landscapes and historic distinctiveness and that developers must demonstrate how their development will complement and enhance existing features of historic significance including their wider settings, in particular in relation to conservation areas, listed buildings and other identified heritage assets.

Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting.

The proposed outdoor seating area lies within the setting of the following listed buildings:-

1. Former Lloyd's Bank at junction with Tatton Road (Grade II)
2. War Memorial (Grade II)
3. Church of Saint Paul (Grade II)

The significance of these heritage assets lies in their fabric and in their urban and community context which demonstrates the historic development of Sale.

There would be no impact on the fabric of any of the heritage assets. There would be some tandem views of the proposed development with the designated heritage assets and therefore some impact on their setting. The setting of all three assets is much altered from its original context as would be expected in a town centre location which has been subject to redevelopment and change over time. As such the setting of these heritage assets is not particularly sensitive to further incremental change, particularly, in the context of the wider town centre and available tandem views along School Road, Tatton Road and Springfield Road, of such limited scope. It is therefore considered that although the setting of these heritage assets would change, this change would not harm the significance of the heritage assets. There is therefore no need to assess the proposals against Paragraphs 133 and 134 of the NPPF, which deal with 'substantial' and 'less than substantial' harm to heritage assets as this level of harm would not arise. The proposals therefore comply with Policy R1 of the Core Strategy.

**HELEN JONES, DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND CORPORATE DIRECTOR,  
ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT:**

**Rebecca Coley, Head of Planning and Development, Planning Department,  
1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH  
Telephone 0161 912 3149**

This page is intentionally left blank