

# Public Document Pack



**TRAFFORD  
COUNCIL**

## **AGENDA PAPERS FOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Date: Thursday, 9 March 2017**

**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, B. Sharp, J. Smith, L. Walsh and J.A. Wright

#### 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 AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 9<sup>th</sup> March 2017

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="#"><u>86160</u></a>	Land at Lock Lane, Partington	Bucklow St Martins	1		✓
<a href="#"><u>89432</u></a>	Land adjacent to 8 Primrose Avenue/Urmston Market, Railway Road, Urmston, M41 0TY	Urmston	46	✓	✓
<a href="#"><u>89558</u></a>	42 - 44 Brook Road, Flixton, M41 5RY	Flixton	67	✓	
<a href="#"><u>89646</u></a>	55 Poplar Grove & land to the rear of 51-53 Moss Vale Road, Urmston, M41 9BN	Urmston	82		✓
<a href="#"><u>90029</u></a>	Unit 16 -19a, White City Retail Park, Chester Road, Stretford, M16 0RP	Longford	104		✓
<a href="#"><u>90056</u></a>	97 Moss Lane, Sale, M33 5BS	St Marys	117	✓	✓
<a href="#"><u>90160</u></a>	61 Washway Road, Sale, M33 7SS	Priory	134	✓	
<a href="#"><u>90208</u></a>	1 Central Avenue, Sale, M33 4JA	Broadheath	148		✓

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:**

**FOR: Miss Carly Hinde  
(Agent)**

## **CONSULTATIONS**

**Sport England** – As Sport England was not a consultee on the original planning application, they have no comments to make on this application.

**Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM)** – TfGM have reviewed the updated information issued in support of the application for extension of time to implement permission for the proposed Development at Lock Lane in Partington. The document provided does not include junction impact assessments. The TA argues that available reports and assessments (Carrington Village) that review the impacts of the Lock Lane development, and nearby larger developments, confirm that there are no remote off-site impacts that need to be addressed and the planning permission should therefore be extended without delay. It also states that there is no junction that is taken over capacity by the Lock Lane traffic alone.

Although TfGM don't disagree with the above it is important to note that some of the junctions that were assessed as part of the previous work on the Lock Lane development do not feature in the recent Carrington Village TA. Therefore any previous junction which has been assessed as part of the original application and which are not in one of the more recent TAs should be re-assessed under current conditions i.e. with all relevant committed developments, highway changes etc. etc. implemented since the original application.

A review of the original TA reveals that the following junctions were assessed at the time:

- Warburton Lane / Dunham Rd
- Warburton Lane / Central Rd
- Manchester Road / Moss Lane
- Carrington Lane / Carrington Spur

TfGM would recommend that these junctions should be reassessed for present and future conditions.

It would be prudent to ensure that the road network is adequately designed to accommodate buses. This should include carriageway widths, appropriate traffic calming measures and suitable locations for bus stop infrastructure such as shelters and raised kerbs. Further guidance is available from Transport for Greater Manchester should the applicant require it.

## LHA Comments:

In response to TfGM's suggestion that further reassessment of the junctions referred to above should be undertaken, the LHA are satisfied that the original modelling at three of these four junctions indicated sufficient capacity, and that further modelling is not required.

The initial model of the Carrington Lane / Carrington Spur (Banky Lane) junction showed this to be over capacity and that the impact of the development here was not significant. This junction has also been recently been modelled by Himor (New Carrington Development) including the Lock Lane development flows. The LHA and TfGM are comfortable with Himor's proposed improvements here. Should the Himor scheme not progress then the LHA wouldn't require any specific improvements at this junction.

**Environment Agency** – The Environment Agency had requested a planning condition be attached requesting a full structural survey of the ship canal embankment before works commenced on site (see suggested condition 19 on main committee report). The applicant had queried why this condition was required. The Environment Agency have provided further comments stating that such a survey would allow any possible defects to the embankment to be rectified easily before dwellings are built on site ensuring that future occupants would not have to incur any expensive repair costs, should there be any embankment slippage. In addition they refer to embankment erosion that occurred in Warrington during the 2015 flood event. Following further discussions with EA they have suggested that an informative be attached to the decision notice in the event of planning permission being granted. Therefore the suggested condition can be omitted, the following wording is proposed for the informative:-

*A structural survey of the ship canal wall/embankment adjacent to the site should be carried out to ensure of its structural integrity and remedial works undertaken as necessary prior to the commencement of dwellings construction. This should be discussed and agreed with the Manchester Ship Canal Company/Peel Holdings.*

## REPRESENTATIONS

Four additional letters of objection have been received citing the following issues of concern:-

- Lock Lane has seen an increase in traffic and also cars speed along it.
- Congested at the school end of Lock Lane
- Doctors surgeries and schools are full
- New builds are for sale with more housing in the pipeline.
- The A6144 is congested most of the time
- The wildlife on the site will suffer and yet another green area will be obliterated.
- Properties on Inglewood Close will be devalued due to being overlooked
- Already suffer noise from the Cadishead bypass, this development will exacerbate that situation.

- The access to Manchester Rd from the Hall Lane/Lock Lane/Manchester New Road junction is already busy and the development will add to this – An alternative access route to Manchester Road should be explored.
- The area selected for development is within the HS2 catchment area with the proposed railway line being built 1 to 1.5 miles away over the ship canal adding to the congestion on Lock Lane and surrounding roads.

## **PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT**

Paragraph 20 – Additional wording as follows: It should also be noted that the application site is an allocated development site within the Trafford Core Strategy and was subject to a sequential test as part of the plan adoption process. Paragraph 33 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance is clear that developments already allocated and sequentially tested as part of the local plan process are deemed to have satisfied the sequential test. However, as the proposal would result in the provision of housing (a more vulnerable use) in Flood Zone 3 an exception test assessment was undertaken as part of the local plan standing advice report completed for the Core Strategy, relating to PPS25 Flood Risk assessment (Government advice at that time now superseded by NPPF). The three areas addressed as part of the exception test were:-

- a) *Would the development provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk, informed by a SFRA where one has been prepared?*
- b) *Is the development on developable previously developed land? Or, if it is not on previously developed land, are there no reasonable alternative sites on developable previously developed land? and;*
- c) *Could a FRA demonstrate that the development will be safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall?*

The conclusion reached was that the proposed development at Partington Canalside would deliver a significant number of sustainability benefits to the community. Although the proposal would take place on a greenfield site, the Council were satisfied that there were no reasonable alternative sites on developable previously developed land that could accommodate the quantum of development necessary to make the required contribution to the regeneration priorities of Partington.

17% of the area was identified as a high risk of flooding and the Trafford Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) specifies that more vulnerable uses should be steered to lower risk areas. It was recognised that if those parts of the site at highest risk were to be excluded from residential development, Partington Canalside could still accommodate 550 dwellings at a density of circa 42 dwellings per hectare, which is considered to be an appropriate density for the area. Consequently, subject to the proposed housing being located outside of the portion of the area that is at the highest risk, it was considered that the proposals

for more vulnerable development (i.e. residential) would be likely to pass the Exception Test and would require submission of a site specific FRA.

As detailed within the main report to committee at paragraph 20, a specific FRA was submitted with this application which details that land levels would be raised sufficiently to ensure that the areas of site at medium and high risk from flooding are elevated to Flood Zone 1 (lowest risk of flooding), this goes further than just locating development out of high risk areas. Two areas of the site are proposed to be raised, one area towards the north-east side of the site (adjacent to the redundant railway line) and one centrally extending up to the rear boundaries of 116 – 160 Lock Lane. In addition the proposals also include providing suitable compensatory flood storage within the site and not moving flood risk elsewhere. The Environment Agency have requested that a condition be attached (see suggested condition 9 on the main report to Planning Committee) providing details of existing ground levels and proposed finished floor levels before works commence on site.

Paragraph 24 – Additional wording as follows: The Revised Unitary Development Plan Policies (RUDP) are effectively superseded by the Core Strategy identifying the site for residential development.

### **ACCESSIBILITY, TRAFFIC GENERATION AND HIGHWAY SAFETY**

Peak and Northern Footpath Society have provided comments on the application as reported within the main report to Planning and Development Management Committee. They have requested that a planning condition be attached to ensure no obstruction to a public right of way (PROW). As part of the previous approval an appropriate Informative was included on the decision notice advising the applicant of the need to keep the definitive rights of way free from obstruction, as such it is considered appropriate to include a similar informative in the event that planning permission is granted for this development.

### **HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT**

Replace existing text at paragraphs 76 to 79 with the following text:

Paragraph 58 of the committee report identifies a number of mitigation schemes identified at the time the previous application was considered. In addition to these, it has been concluded that improvements are necessary to assist with the introduction of additional capacity, highway deflections and improvements to the pedestrian provision at the junction of Hall Lane and Manchester Road roundabout. This improvement can be secured by a Grampian style condition which is included in the revised recommendation below.

A planning s106 obligation to provide improvements to the highway network and improvements to public transport is required to make the development acceptable. Unlike the previous application (H/OUT/68617), when it was considered that the full contribution should go to public transport improvements, it is considered that there has been a material change in planning circumstances in that improvements to the A6144 Manchester Road have become a higher priority. It is therefore recommended that a sum of £384,000 is to be secured, index

linked from the previous contribution associated with the original scheme to be spent on highway improvements. A specific scheme has been identified by the LHA:

- Contribution to improvements at Manchester Road/ Flixton Road/ Isherwood Road junction either independently or in conjunction with any necessary improvements brought forward as a result of the delivery of other schemes in the vicinity, or a contribution to the proposed link road to and through the development site at Carrington.
- Any remaining monies will be used for enhancement to public transport, specifically a contribution towards the provision of bus stops and any necessary access improvements to allow buses to serve the development.

## **CONCLUSION**

Paragraph 99, first bullet point, amended wording as follows: A substantial contribution to the Borough's housing land supply, and in particular the 850 new dwellings for Partington identified in Policy L3.4. This figure of 850 new dwellings relates to all of the Partington area, not just the development site which forms part of the planning application being considered and which can potentially deliver up to 550 dwellings.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That Members resolve that they would be **MINDED TO GRANT** planning permission for the development and that the determination of the application hereafter be deferred and delegated to the Head of Planning and Development as follows:-

- (i) To complete a suitable legal agreement under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure :
  - 1.46ha of open space on site;
  - The provision of the 'Green Loop' and;
  - A contribution of £384,000 to highways and public transport improvements in the vicinity of the site and specifically the following identified schemes:-
    - a) Contribution to improvements at Manchester Road/ Flixton Road/ Isherwood Road junction either independently or in conjunction with any necessary improvements brought forward as a result of the delivery of other schemes in the vicinity, or a contribution to the proposed link road to and through the development site at Carrington.
    - b) Public Transport enhancements – contribution for the provision of bus stops and any



necessary access improvements to allow buses to serve the development.

- (ii) To carry out minor drafting amendments to any planning condition.
- (iii) To have discretion to determine the application appropriately in the circumstances where a S106 agreement has not been completed within three months of the resolution to grant planning permission.
- (iv) That upon satisfactory completion of the above legal agreement that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions (unless amended by (ii) above): -

Conditions as listed on the main report to committee with the following amendments and additional conditions:-

Condition 3 (Amended wording as follows):- The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers:-

- Drawing No: 298A-48
- Drawing No: Singleton Clamp 06206/01/002 A (Proposed East Access Point Lock Lane)
- Drawing No: Singleton Clamp 06206/01/005 A (Proposed School Parking Arrangement – Option 1)
- Drawing No: Singleton Clamp 06206/01/006 A (Proposed School Parking Arrangement – Option 2)
- Partington Village: Development Principles Document: Revision A May 2012

Reason: To clarify the permission, having regard to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 8 (Amended wording as follows):- Full details of the layout, appearance, and landscaping of the entire length of the canalside promenade (including the creation of ecological areas and details of hard landscaping and street furniture including railings, lighting, seating and paving and surfacing of terraces, footpaths and cycleways and details of terracing / retaining walls adjacent to the canal) shall be submitted as part of or concurrently with the first application for reserved matters approval. These details shall include a programme for the implementation of the promenade and any arrangements for a temporary route to enable access along the Manchester Ship Canal during the construction period. Prior to works first taking place on each phase of development, full details and an implementation programme / timetable for the section of promenade fronting that phase of development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The promenade shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timetable. Any trees or shrubs planted in accordance with this condition that are removed, uprooted, destroyed, die or become severely damaged or seriously diseased

within five years of planting shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees and shrubs of similar size and species to those originally planted.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, residential amenity, sustainable development, community safety and ecology, having regard to policies L3, L4, L7, R2, L8, R2, R3, R5 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. The condition requires the submission of information prior to the commencement of development because the approved details will need to be incorporated into the development at design stage.

Condition 19 – To be deleted

Condition 26 (amended wording as follows):- No residential unit shall be occupied until details of a scheme and timetable to upgrade the footpath between the boundary of the application site and Scroggins Lane to form a pedestrian and cycle route have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented and the pedestrian and cycle route shall be provided in full accordance with the approved details and to the approved timetable. The route shall be retained thereafter for pedestrian and cycle use.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian and cycle connectivity and permeability and encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport, having regard policy L4 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 33 - No development or phase of development shall take place until a Crime Impact Statement has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Statement shall demonstrate how Secured by Design principles will be incorporated into the design of the development to prevent crime and enhance community safety. Thereafter development shall proceed in accordance with the approved details, which shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that appropriate details are incorporated into the design stage of the development, in the interests of crime prevention and the enhancement of community safety, having regard to Core Strategy Policy L7 and the National Planning Policy Framework. This condition requires the submission of information prior to works starting on site because the approved details will need to be incorporated into the development at design stage.

Condition 35 - No residential unit shall be occupied unless and until a scheme for improvement works to the Hall Lane /Manchester Road roundabout has been implemented in full accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, residential amenity and the character and visual appearance of the area, having regard to policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Page 46 89432/HYB/16: Land adjacent to 8 Primrose Avenue/Urmston Market, Railway Road, Urmston**

<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	<b>Michael Lowe (Neighbour)</b>
	<b>FOR:</b>	<b>Paul Carr (Agent)</b>

**Conditions**

Condition number 22 is to be amended to reduce hours for refuse and recycling collections in the interest of amenity. This shall also restrict refuse and recycling collections on Public Holidays. Condition 22 shall read:

22. Refuse and recycling collections in relation to the 'Outline' component of the development shall only take place between the hours of 07.30 and 21.00 on Monday to Saturday and at no time on Sundays or Bank/Public Holidays.

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

**Page 67 89558/COU/16: 42 - 44 Brook Road, Flixton**

<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	<b>Simon Goodhall (Neighbour)</b>
	<b>FOR:</b>	

**REPRESENTATIONS**

**Neighbours:** An additional letter has been received from the occupier of No. 36, Brook Road. Main points set out below:

- The timing of the report is unfair as it contains inaccurate statements which cannot be challenged now the consultation period has finished
- When residents were asked to give their views on the amended plans they were not aware of important facts like days / times of opening and what the premises would be used for.
- The report is misleading in suggesting that the previous ground floor use was operated 8am-6pm Monday-Saturday as it operated between 8.30 - 4.30pm Monday to Friday and never on a weekend. In addition the Martial Arts Studios have never been open all week and have never stayed open until 10pm as the report suggests.
- With regard to the privacy impacts the windows in the rear at first floor have not just been replaced by new ones they were previously bricked up and had boards there.

- It is incorrect to suggest it will 'bring back into use a long established local building' as the building was in use right up to the start of refurbishment.
- How are the parking requirements calculated as it does not reflect the number of people potentially associated with the proposed uses. Misleading to suggest most of the customers will walk as this will not happen. The impact of the proposal will be severe.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

The above points are dealt with in turn.

### **Timing of the Report**

There is nothing to prevent neighbours making further comments following the report being published on the Council's website. Any additional comments can be reported in the Additional Information Report as is the case here.

### **Residents Unaware of the Facts**

When neighbours are re-consulted on amended plans the proposed hours / days of operation are not stated as these are recommendations to Committee and are not yet decided. The proposed use was clearly stated in the amended description of the development on the re-consultation letters.

### **Previous Hours of Operation**

The report does not comment on the hours / day upon which the various previous occupiers of the premises operated. The report states the hours and days of operation these uses would be allowed to operate under the previous planning permissions should they wish to do so. These permissions run with the building and not the occupiers and therefore the stated hours and days in the report are what a future user could operate within.

### **Rear First Floor Windows**

The existing and proposed rear elevation drawings submitted did not indicate the presence of any boarded up windows and at the time of the site visit the first floor rear windows nearest to No. 36 Brook Road were glazed. However it does appear that at some point the larger window was been boarded up. However glazing remained behind the boarding and planning permission would not be required to remove the boarding at any time or to replace the glazing. The existing planning permission for the first floor use of the building would allow members of the public into the building until 10pm on any day and the current hours of operation until 7pm are therefore materially reduced.

### Period of Vacancy

The report does not state that the building has been out of use for a long period of time simply that it will bring it back into use as the previous occupier is no longer operating a business from the building.

### Highways Issues

The parking standards quoted in the report are correct and state the following;

<b>Use Class</b>		<b>Proposed Area</b>	<b>Maximum Parking</b>
A3 Restaurant/Cafe	1 space per 5sqm of public floor area	110sqm	22 Spaces
D1 Non-residential Institutions – Crèche, Day Nursery & Day Centres	1 space per member of staff	N/A	1 Space
D2 Assembly & Leisure – Dance Halls (but not nightclubs)	1 space per 22sqm	111sqm	5 Spaces
<b>Total</b>			<b>28 Spaces</b>

This parking standard is based on maximum standards.

The development relies wholly on the on-street parking provision which is similar to the other retail/ businesses in Brook Road (excluding the Public House) which have no dedicated off-street facilities.

In determining the level of parking demand the proposals will generate the previous uses and what traffic was or could be generated by them has to be considered and used as a comparison.

The proposed opening times and availability of parking on-street during this time, particularly at the likely peak trading times are also relevant. It could be argued that the café facility offers a further retail choice and that some afternoon trade from the Chip Shop take-away may transfer, meaning that traffic would already be visiting the location and would not be new trips to the area.

The premises has a wide residential catchment area and the walking provisions from these residential neighbourhoods are good. The premises are not on or near to a designated cycle route but the majority of surrounding roads are residential in nature which would make it an attractive prospect to cycle to the café.

The fall-back position is relevant i.e. if the premises were to operate as per the previous planning approvals.

The proposed development will result in increased trips to the location to that which was previously occurring. However, a number of the person trips are likely to be linked – i.e. parents will bring their children (and their friends) to the play area and also make use of the café/restaurant as a single vehicle trip.

There will also be some short stay parking associated with the sandwich shop element to the café but the majority of customers are expected to live locally and would choose to walk. Those who do choose to travel to the café by car may do so as part of a linked shopping trip to the other business in the parade of shops on Brook Road, which would again reduce the traffic impact which may otherwise be generated by the proposals.

For clarification the definition of “severe impact” from the NPPF is as follows:-

*Plans and decisions should take account of whether:*

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure*
- Safe and sustainable access to the site can be achieved for all people, and*
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of the development are severe.*

## **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the following conditions should be amended to read as follows:

7. There shall be no external handling, collection, servicing or disposal of refuse and/or recycled materials between the hours of 21.00 hours and 07.00 hours on any day.

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

11. There shall be no public access by users of the premises to the shaded rear yard area shown on drawing ref. A0.13 dated February 2017 and this shaded rear yard area shall not be used for sitting out and no tables, chairs or seating shall be placed in the shaded area. Prior to the use hereby approved first taking place a 1.2 metre high timber fence shall be erected in the location shown on drawing ref. A0.13 and retained in situ in perpetuity to prevent access to the shaded area of the rear yard as shown on the plan by users of the premises.

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

**Page 82 89646/FUL/16: 55 Poplar Grove & land to the rear of 51-53 Moss Vale Road, Urmston**

<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	
	<b>FOR:</b>	<b>Matthew Eckersley (Applicant)</b>

Replace reference number on map with 89646/FUL/16.

Map correctly identified the application site, however incorrect references the previous planning application on the site.

**Page 104 90029/VAR/16: Unit 16 - 19a, White City Retail Park, Chester Road, Stretford**

<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	
	<b>FOR:</b>	<b>Mark Aylward (Agent)</b>

### **Recommendation**

Part (A) is deleted and replaced with the following:-

That the application will propose a satisfactory development for the site upon completion of a unilateral undertaking which will secure the revocation of the mezzanine floor space in the approved units and revoke the ability to trade unit 3 (on the eastern side of the retail park) for the sale of open A1 food and convenience goods. The obligation in the Section 106 Agreement relating to 84970/VAR/2015 will be repeated in this Legal Agreement/Unilateral Undertaking.

**Page 117 90056/FUL/16: 97 Moss Lane, Sale**

<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	<b>Alan Evans (For Neighbour)</b>
	<b>FOR:</b>	<b>Patrick Heneghan (Applicant)</b>

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

The applicant has submitted a further site plan and amended highway statement. This states that the development would achieve the required 43m visibility splay to its southern side from the proposed new site access.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

### **HIGHWAYS AND PARKING**

Appropriateness of Access

Para.38 of the report currently reads:

38. The development proposals detail the erection of a new access point for the application site to its western most side via Moss Lane. It is noted that the required visibility splay of 43m is unlikely to be achieved on the southern side of this proposed new access, however it should be noted that an existing access, at this location is sited on the opposite side of Moss Lane and as such the current proposals are also considered to be acceptable.

It should be noted that the applicant has now submitted a supporting highway statement and amended plan to show that the required visibility splay of 43m is met by the proposed site access to its southern side.

**Page 134 90160/FUL/16: 61 Washway Road, Sale**

**SPEAKER(S)**

**AGAINST:**

**Paul Davis  
(Neighbour)**

**FOR:**

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

**Neighbours:**

No. 1 Broadoaks Road

A letter of objection has been received from the occupant of No. 1 Broadoaks Road which raises the following issues (several of these issues raised by the original objector and the Councilor):

- The proposal would result in an overdevelopment of the site.
- The proposed development would result in a change to the general impression of the local area from residential to commercial. The current property gives a residential impression which is in keeping with neighbouring properties with a garden on three sides.
- The increased size would result in increased traffic along Broadoaks Road, which is a residential cul-de-sac. This objector asks whether the access could be repositioned to Washway Road. The proposed car parking spaces would be insufficient to accommodate the expected number of staff, with 2 of the



proposed spaces being inaccessible in that they will be accessed via other proposed spaces.

- Concern that the site's opening hours would increase post development. The objector wants assurance that this will not be the case.
- The proposal would result in the removal of several mature trees – could the development not retain these?
- Lack of consultation of neighbouring properties along Broadoaks Road.

### No. 2 Broadoaks Road

A further comment has been received from the occupant of No. 2 Broadoaks Road (the adjacent property to the south-east/rear of the application site), which raises the following issues:

- The window to their daughter's bedroom is not obscurely glazed as noted in the published Committee report. This comment relates to their concern that the proposed extension would introduce rear facing windows which would directly face windows in their gable elevation, including their daughter's side facing bedroom window.
- A further concern is that the proposed development will directly overlook their conservatory.
- Unless the proposed rear facing second floor windows are obscured this would unacceptably undermine their privacy, including when using their back garden.

### **Councillor:**

A further Councillor comment has been received which refers to the fact that paragraph 24 of the published Committee report states the side facing loft level bedroom window is obscurely glazed which is incorrect. The Councillor requests that this is amended.

The Councillor requests that provision is made for the proposed rear facing windows to be obscurely glazed to maintain the privacy of No. 2 Broadoaks Road.

### **Consultee Comments:**

A further comment has been received from the Local Highways Authority (LHA).

This comment is in response to concerns raised by the original objector (No. 2 Broadoaks Road) that the site would not have enough parking spaces post development to accommodate expected staff and visitor levels, which in turn

would result in unacceptable traffic and parking issues on the adjacent Broadoaks Road.

The LHA consultee's further comment is also in response to a further question from the assessing officer regarding whether the repositioned vehicle entrance on Broadoaks Road would be acceptable.

In response the LHA consultee has confirmed the following:

- The proposed development would have 13 on-site parking spaces which would exceed the requirements as set down in SPD3 Parking Standards and Design which require a maximum provision of 9 spaces.
- The proposed amended access would be acceptable.

The above objections/issues will be addressed in turn.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

### **Neighbour Objection – No. 1 Broadoaks Road**

- It is not considered that the proposed extensions would result in an overdevelopment of the site with a substantial area of the plot retained for car parking and landscaping post development.
- Whilst it is accepted that the proposed development would indeed alter the current building's current domestic appearance with the amended elevations and extensions resulting in a more recognisably commercial and office type property, as noted in paragraph 9 of the report this is nevertheless considered to be acceptable with reference to the site's location on Washway Road with several commercial and office type buildings fronting this road, including the medical centre immediately to the south-west.
- It is noted that the LHA consultee has confirmed no objection to the proposal's on-site parking provision, its highways or parking impacts on Broadoaks Road or the amended vehicle access. As noted in paragraph 30 of the report the proposed on-site parking provision would comply with the SPD3 standards, with these standards in fact being exceeded. The proposed provision of 2 parking spaces which would only be accessible via other proposed spaces is not unacceptable, particularly with reference to the fact that the proposed on-site parking provision exceeds the SPD3 requirements. Paragraph 30 also notes that this site is in a sustainable location with good public transport links and that the development's impact on Broadoaks Road in terms of road use and on-street parking would be mitigated by the fact that for non-permit holders on-street parking is limited to a maximum of 2 hours.
- The applicant proposes standard office hours of 9am to 5pm Monday to Friday, which would be acceptable.

- As noted within paragraph 36 of the report the LPA accepts the proposed removal of several on-site trees to facilitate the development, with the remainder of the on-site trees and the off-site trees retained to soften the impact of the development. Planning permission would be subject to standard tree protection conditions and a landscaping condition to secure replacement planting.
- The LPA carried out neighbour consultation as per Development Management Procedure Order requirements.

Further Neighbour Objection Comment No. 2 Broadoaks Road/Further Councillor Comment

- It is accepted that the wording of paragraph 24 of the published report incorrectly refers to No. 2 Broadoaks Road as having an obscurely glazed side facing loft level bedroom window, with the obscurely glazed window at this level instead being the dormer window serving the stairwell providing access to the loft level. A subsequent telephone conversation with the occupant of No. 2 Broadoaks Road confirmed that the side facing bedroom window whose privacy they are concerned to maintain is a roof light set into the building's side facing roof slope. The LPA does not consider that this is a window type meriting the same level of protection as a 'normal' bedroom window vertically set in the property's side wall. Moreover, the rooflights incorporated in the rear elevation of the proposed extension are to be set at least 1.7 metres above the finished floor level, which in itself would design out any scope for overlooking the bedroom rooflight at 2 Broadoaks Road.
- It is not considered that the proposed rear facing windows would result in an unacceptable privacy impact on this neighbouring property's conservatory with views at ground floor level into the conservatory's facing glazed side wall largely screened by the retained 1.8m high wood panel fence marking the common boundary. It is also not considered that angled views down from the proposed rear facing first floor windows and roof lights towards the conservatory's roof at a minimum separation distance of 15m would result in an unacceptable privacy impact. The proposed extension's windows would not directly face the garden area to the rear of No. 2 Broadoaks Road with the overlooked area comprising of this property's gable elevation, which is already in part visible within the street scene, and conservatory roof.
- It is not considered necessary to require the proposed rear facing windows to be obscurely glazed to protect the privacy of this neighbouring property.
- Nevertheless paragraph 24 should be corrected to read:

*As noted above the side facing dormer is obscurely glazed, this window serving the stairwell leading up to the neighbour's loft level bedroom. This bedroom has several roof lights providing outlooks and access to light, including a roof light in*

*the side facing roof slope directly facing the applicant's site. Whilst it is accepted that this neighbouring window would face three windows in the proposed extension, but these are set 1.7 metres above floor level as explained above..*

Further LHA Consultee Comment

- The further LHA consultee comments are currently reflected in the Committee report.
- No further observations are made with respect to the proposed development.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The recommendation remains unchanged.

**Page 148 90208/HHA/16: 1 Central Avenue, Sale**

**SPEAKER(S)**

**AGAINST:**

**FOR:**

**Mrs Mandy Samra  
(Applicant)**

**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, 1st Floor, Trafford  
Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH. Telephone 0161 912 3149**