

Public Document Pack



**TRAFFORD
COUNCIL**

AGENDA PAPERS FOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

Date: Thursday, 8 November 2018

Time: 6.30 pm

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

AGENDA

ITEM

4. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT

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

4

JIM TAYLOR

Interim Chief Executive

Membership of the Committee

Councillors L. Walsh (Chair), A.J. Williams (Vice-Chair), Dr. K. Barclay, D. Bunting, T. Carey, G. Coggins, N. Evans, D. Hopps, S. Longden, E. Malik, E. Patel, E.W. Stennett 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

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

AGENDA ITEM 4

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 8th November 2018

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 RECOMMENDATION	For REC.
<u>93818</u>	Meadowside, Torbay Road, Urmston, M41 9LH	Urmston	1		
<u>94950</u>	School Development Site, Audley Avenue, Stretford	Gorse Hill	31	✓	✓
<u>95168</u>	8 Lowton Road, Sale, M33 4LD	Broadheath	61		
<u>95257</u>	Unit 1 & 2, Victoria Avenue, Timperley, WA15 6SE	Broadheath	67	✓	
<u>95301</u>	5 Cranford Road, Flixton, M41 8PS	Davyhulme West	80		
<u>95501</u>	Urmston Leisure Centre, Bowfell Road, Urmston, M41 5RR	Flixton	93	✓	✓
<u>95526</u>	41 & 43 Norley Drive, Sale, M33 2JE	Sale Moor	115		
<u>95702</u>	Downs View, 2 Delamer Road, Bowdon, WA14 2NE	Bowdon	122		
<u>95791</u>	34 Acacia Avenue, Hale, WA15 8QY	Hale Central	129		

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant's agent was provided with a list of the draft pre-commencement conditions to agree and queried the need for condition 17 which required a further emergence and activity survey for bats to be conducted at a suitable time of year and by a suitably qualified person prior to demolition work commencing. They questioned the need for a further emergence and activity survey on the basis that their bat consultant considered it should be possible to undertake the demolition under a precautionary method statement, with some input from the bat consultant on site at the time due to the low risk of use by roosting bats.

CONSULTATION

GM Ecology Unit – Comment in response to the applicant's request that the follow up survey was requested by condition on the basis of the applicant's bat consultant's original recommendations. However on the basis that the bat consultant has now stated that she is happy for the demolition to go ahead without the follow up survey, as long as a precautionary method statement is submitted, the GMEU would have no objection to proceeding on this basis provided that a replacement condition is attached requiring that a precautionary method statement is submitted to the LPA and agreed, prior to any demolition works commencing.

OBSERVATIONS

Bats

No bats or signs of bats were found during the original inspection carried out by the applicant's bat consultant. However on the basis that the original survey found that the building had some, sub-optimal, bat roosting potential the applicant's bat consultant considered it fell into a low risk category rather than minimal risk.

It is noted that the requirement for an emergence and activity survey would result in a delay in the demolition of the building due to the time of year such surveys have to be carried out. Due to the low risk identified, the applicant's bat consultant and the GMEU consider that if a suitable precautionary methodology was adopted at the time of the demolition, accompanied by the creation of alternative bat roosting potential in the new build as required under condition 19, the submission of a precautionary method statement rather than a further emergence and activity survey would be acceptable. It is therefore considered on the basis of this advice that the change to the wording of Condition 17 would be appropriate and compliant with Policy R2 and the NPPF. The applicant's agent has confirmed their agreement to the amended wording.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Condition 17 should be amended from the original wording set out in the Committee report as follows:

Prior to any demolition works first taking place, a further emergence and activity survey for bats shall be conducted at a suitable time of year and by a suitably qualified person. The results of this further survey and of previous surveys must then be used to prepare a comprehensive method statement giving details of mitigation measures to be taken in relation to bats. Demolition works shall not take place until this method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be carried out other than in full accordance with the approved method statement.

to read as follows:

17. Prior to any demolition works first taking place a precautionary method statement in relation to bats that may be present on site, to be prepared by a suitably qualified person, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be carried out other than in full accordance with the approved method statement.

Page 31 94950/FUL/18: School Development Site, Audley Avenue, Stretford

SPEAKER(S) **AGAINST: Miss Sue Chadwick
(Neighbour)**

**FOR: Mr Graham Love
(Agent)**

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

1. Since the original Committee Report was published, the applicant has advised that they are able to provide a greater financial contribution towards the provision of improved off-site open space. The amount offered is £78,787.50 which has been calculated using figures set out within the Council's former SPD Planning Obligations – Technical Note 4: Green Infrastructure and recreation. This is also now based upon the site area (confirmed as being 10,505sqm) rather than the gross internal floorspace of the proposed building and Officers consider this to be the correct approach, as stated in the original Committee Report. The figure of £90,000 given in the Committee Report was an estimate based upon the total application site area, which included areas which do not constitute open space. Officers are satisfied that the amount now being offered has been appropriately calculated. Therefore, there is no longer a shortfall in

the level of contribution being offered and the application is now policy compliant in this respect.

2. The original Committee Report notes that *“given that no specific scheme of mitigation or improvements has been identified for this contribution, other than it would be spent on the upgrade of open space and wildlife/biodiversity features at Lostock Park, and as there is a shortfall in the level of financial contribution, it cannot be concluded that the above contribution will result in ‘equivalent or better quality in a suitable location to meet present and predicted future demand’ as required by the Core Strategy”*. The second element of this (i.e. the level of financial contribution) has been addressed given the amount now being offered. It is however necessary to consider whether it can reasonably be concluded that this will meet the Core Strategy requirement of ‘equivalent or better quality’ open space provision, in order to determine whether the proposal is now in accordance with the Development Plan.
3. It has been demonstrated that these funds can go towards enhancing the semi natural greenspace role of Lostock Park through measures such as woodland, wildflower meadows and bulb planting, along with access improvements and improvements to the quality of open space facilities at the park. It is noted that a detailed scheme would need to be prepared to determine exactly how these funds would be spent. Given that the open space to be lost has now been appropriately financially valued, it is considered that improvements which are needed elsewhere (i.e. within Lostock Park), carried out at this cost and to a scope identified by Council officers, are likely to represent as a minimum an equivalence in quality of open space provision.
4. Given the above, Officers are now able to conclude that the proposed development is now in accordance with Policies R3 and R5 of the adopted Core Strategy and the Development Plan in all other respects. Consequently, in the context of NPPF Paragraph 11 (c), the application should be approved ‘without delay’.

SECURITY AND SAFETY

5. A recommendation of the submitted Crime Impact Statement is that the car park should be secured with a 2.4m high fence to prevent damage and unauthorised access. The applicant has confirmed that this is not being proposed as the school does not wish to give the impression of a high-security/uninviting school entrance. Officers are satisfied that such a fence is not desirable in the interests of visual amenity and as such, this will not be required.

CONTAMINATED LAND

6. Since the Committee Report was produced, the applicant and the Council's Pollution and Licensing section have agreed a remediation scheme in principle which removes the need for further investigation to take place. On this basis, it is recommended that the original condition 3 is amended as set out at the end of this update report.

CONCLUSION

7. Officers are now able to conclude that the proposed development is now in accordance with Policies R3 and R5 of the adopted Core Strategy and the Development Plan in all other respects. Consequently, in the context of NPPF Paragraph 11 (c), the application should be approved 'without delay'.

RECOMMENDATION

As original Committee Report, with the exception of part (i) which now reads as follows:

- (i) To complete a suitable legal agreement under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure a contribution of £78,787.50 towards enhancing the semi natural greenspace role of Lostock Park through measures such as woodland, wildflower meadows and bulb planting, along with access improvements and improvements to the quality of open space facilities at the park.

Conditions:

Condition 3 within the Committee Report should be amended to read as follows:

3. No development shall take place unless and until an appraisal of remedial options and proposals of the preferred option(s) to deal with areas of contamination identified at the site, to form a remediation strategy for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the duly approved remediation strategy and a verification report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development hereby approved is first brought into use.

Reason: To ensure the safe development of the site in the interests of the amenity of future occupiers having regard to Core Strategy Policies L5 and L7 and the National Planning Policy Framework. These details are required prior to development taking place on site as any works undertaken beforehand, including preliminary works, could result in risks to site operatives.

Page 61 95168/HHA/18: 8 Lowton Road, Sale

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has submitted an amended plan showing the proposed rear elevation, which was not previously submitted.

RECOMMENDATION

Replace condition 3 with the below:

3. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, number: 07-002 Rev. C and 07-010 – Location Plan.

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

Page 67 95257/VAR/18: Unit 1 & 2, Victoria Avenue, Timperley

SPEAKER(S) **AGAINST: Mr Guy Bennett
(Neighbour)**

FOR:

Page 80 95301/HHA/18: 5 Cranford Road, Flixton

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The agent has confirmed that they wish to formally withdraw the application.

RECOMMENDATION

That Members note the withdrawal and take no further action.

Page 93 95501/FUL/18: Urmston Leisure Centre, Bowfell Road, Urmston

SPEAKER(S) **AGAINST: Ms Lily Whiteley
(Neighbour)**

**FOR: Mr John Hotham
(Applicant)**

Representation:

A late representation was received in relation to this application. The representative supported the improvement to the Leisure Centre, however has a concern with regard to lack of parking spaces and pedestrian and highway safety. The letter does not raise any new points to be considered.

Observation:

The applicant has submitted a supporting statement in response to the objections in relation to disabled provision. In summary the statement confirms full compliance with the Equality Act 2010. Further, it is stated that, '*the scope of works at Urmston is constrained as it is an extension to, and refurbishment of, the existing building and putting to one side the business plan and on-going operational costs involved with these facilities we unfortunately cannot consider any further the facilities being suggested for Urmston. In not including these suggested changes we feel we will not be reducing the level of accessibility of Urmston Leisure Centre to those with disabilities*'. The specific facilities that customers have requested (e.g. Changing Places Toilet, Sensory Room, Hydro Pool etc.) are currently being considered for other schemes, including new build centres (i.e. Altrincham Leisure Centre and Stretford Leisure Centre) and at the appropriate time, will also be considered for Sale Leisure Centre.

Paragraph 28 of the officer's report makes reference to the Disability Discrimination Act. This reference should be replaced by the Equalities Act 2010.

Recommendation:

Replace condition 2 with:

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers:

Title	Drawing No.	Revision:
Proposed Site Plan	05692_MP_00_0003	P
Proposed Ground Floor General Arrangement Plan	05692_B1_02_2200	T
Proposed First Floor General Arrangement	05692_B1_02_2201	R
Proposed Roof Plan General Arrangement	05692_B1_02_2202	P
Proposed Elevations (A & B)	05692_B1_04_2201	L

Proposed Elevations (C & D)	05692_B1_04_2202	N
--------------------------------	------------------	---

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

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