Public Document Pack

# AGENDA PAPERS FOR

## PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

**Date: Thursday, 13 December 2018**

**Time: 6.00 pm**

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

**AGENDA** **ITEM**

5. **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT**

To consider the attached report of the Head of Planning and Development, tabled at the meeting. 5

**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 5**

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 13th December 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 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. |
| 93045 | Howarth Timber, Glebelands Road, Sale, M33 6LB | Ashton On Mersey | 1 | ✓ | |
| 94664 | Land Adjacent To 95 Dunster Drive, Flixton, M41 6WR | Davyhulme West | 12 | | ✓ |
| 95276 | 32 Peel Road, Hale, WA15 9HN | Hale Central | 26 | | |
| 95514 | Car Park, Brown Street, Altrincham | Hale Central | 36 | ✓ | ✓ |
| 95660 | Former Rileys Snooker Club, 1D Bridgewater Road, Altrincham, WA14 1LB | Altrincham | 109 | ✓ | ✓ |
| 95823 | Land At Higher House Farm Dairyhouse Lane, Altrincham | Bowdon | 149 | | ✓ |

**Page 1 93045/FUL/17: Howarth Timber, Glebelands Road, Sale**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **SPEAKER(S)** | **AGAINST:** | **Kate Newman (Neighbour)** |
| | **FOR:** | |

**REPRESENTATIONS**

A further representation has been received from a neighbour that has previously objected to the application. Additional comments received are set out below:

- Proposal would impact adversely on property values;
- Residents are at a disadvantage as the local councillor is unable to attend the meeting due to prior commitments.
- Design and Access Statement have not previously been made available to the public.

**RESIDENTIAL AMENITY**

Paragraph 18 – the following text is to be added to the end of this paragraph:-

"In order to secure the identified improvements to neighbouring residents in relation to noise, it is recommended that a condition is attached to restrict the fork lift trucks from operation outside of opening hours."

**OTHER MATTERS** – new subheading to be inserted between paragraphs 29 and 30 with the following text:-

A neighbour representation has been received which raises concern with regard to the impact of the proposal on the value of adjacent residential properties. This is not a material planning consideration.

Concern has been raised regarding the lack of publicity of the submitted Acoustic Report and Design and Access Statement. There is no statutory requirement to make all associated planning application documents publicly available on the website and this is at the Council's discretion.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The following additional condition is recommended:

3. The forklift trucks used in association with the operation of the business shall not be used outside of the following hours:

Monday – Thursday 7am to 5pm
Friday – 7am to 4pm
Saturday – 8am to 12pm
Sunday – at no time

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity, having regard to Core Strategy Policy L7 and relevant sections of the NPPF.

**Page 12 94664/OUT/18: Land Adjacent To 95 Dunster Drive, Flixton**

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:**

**FOR: Matthew Shipman (Applicant)**

**RESIDENTIAL AMENITY**

Paragraph 38 – replace with the following sentence:

"There are no windows at first floor in the side elevation facing the application site."

**OTHER MATTERS** – new subheading to be inserted between paragraphs 48 and 49 with the following text:

"It was raised in the letters of representation received that the site was originally planned for a children's play area. The historic planning application refers to a play area to be provided in accordance with details to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority. This was not conditioned within the decision notice and the provision of a play area did not form part of the development description. It would appear that a play area has never been provided on the site.

The site is now within the applicant's ownership. The applicant states that the current use of the site is as overspill parking for the wider development and officer observations on site would support this."

**RECOMMENDATION**

Condition 3 to be amended to also include drawing number DDF/SDA/03.

**Page 36 95514/FUL/18: Car Park, Brown Street, Hale**

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: John Groves (For Neighbours)**

**FOR: Justine Cove (Agent)**

**REPRESENTATIONS**

Neighbours: A further 51 letters of objection have been received citing the following concerns:-

- Regardless of how the plans have now changed, this application is not what Hale village needs.
- No amendments made to overcome impact on heritage, the heritage assessment has not been amended to reflect changes
- View from Victoria Road will be a four storey brick wall
- Signage to the car park was more prominent when the car park was free
- Parking survey undertaken when car park was less likely to be used.
- The parking survey is biased and as a minimum Trafford have a duty to conduct their own survey and consult local business owners to protect tax payers from future litigation if the application is recommended for approval and called in.
- Concern that the impact on the railway station has been significantly under estimated by the Council
- Naive to think that potential residents will not require parking at the apartments
- Lack of landscaping
- First floor bedroom in the townhouse insufficient natural light and means of escape.
- No public benefits other than delivering a profit to the Council
- The car ownership data is not reflective of the area
- A low level multi storey car park should be built with no accommodation
- The scheme is not appropriate for disabled access
- This scheme is flawed and will affect the heritage of the village, local residents and businesses.
- It appears that the Council have employed the services of a barrister to assist in writing the committee report
- The Barony of Dunham Massey, Altrincham Court Leet and the Guild of the Freemen of Altrincham have expressed their concern regarding the proposed development.

One letter of support has been received which states that converting an under-used car park in a prime location into residential development with a mixture of open sale and shared ownership is exactly the type of initiative that is needed to help address the chronic housing shortage.

**Hale Civic Society** have submitted a number of subsequent representations following the publication of the officers report to planning committee detailing the following concerns:-

- Railway station car parking is a national issue for both Councils and train operators, there is not enough.
- The submitted surveys by the applicant regarding parking were not carried out in the evening.
- Pre 2010 the Brown Street car park was continually full
- Press articles (included with the representation) highlight the increase in charges and reaction from residents/business unhappy with the charges.
- Lack of appropriate signage for Brown Street
- A commuted sum was paid to the Council as part of the planning application for apartments at the Pizza Express building

- The proposal is massive and gross overdevelopment and out of keeping with Hale Station Conservation Area
- Disagree with the Council with regards the impact on Hale Station
- Hale is not a town centre like Altrincham
- Trafford Council is urged to reconsider this application and work with the community, conduct proper consultations

**Graham Brady MP** has objected to the proposal, citing concern that the original tendering process stated that 80 car parking spaces would be maintained, that original commitment should be honoured. Concern that Hale village is struggling to trade due to a number of challenges including the resurgence of Altrincham and that a further reduction in parking will exacerbate this.

**Councillor Haddad** has objected to the proposed development citing the following concerns:-

- Height, scale and mass of the building, it is 4 storeys compared with neighbouring properties which are predominantly 2 storeys
- Design of the building does not fit with the surrounding architecture and materials
- Impact on the Hale station Conservation Area (station and adjacent buildings) affecting views from neighbouring roads
- Reduction of public car parking spaces - the council stipulated 80 parking spaces should be retained but as far as we understand this scheme only provides 66 parking spaces of which 10 will be reserved for the houses and 12 as permit parking for the apartments, leaving just 44 public parking spaces. This would have a detrimental effect on local residents, commuters, shops and businesses
- I do not believe that the same standards have been used to consider this application as used when considering previous planning applications for the community centre and library proposed from Hale Community Trust. I am concerned that the public consultation on this application has not been adequate. I am hearing a public outcry from residents that public land is not being developed in the best interests of Hale residents.

A Supplementary Objection Statement has been submitted by **John Groves Town Planning** on behalf of Hale Community Trust and Hale Civic Society citing the following concerns:-

- Additional information has only been in the public domain in the week prior to planning committee, contrary to the provisions of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985.
- The proposal has been recommended for approval despite objections from statutory consultees and statutory undertakers (Network Rail and United Utilities)
- The proposal has not been subject to a viability assessment to demonstrate that the amount of affordable housing reflects the value of the development.
- Convoluted and potentially unenforceable solutions have been sought to address concerns over the impact on highway safety.

- The speed data is only provided in summary, no way of assessing its veracity or relevance.
- Parking surveys are limited
- Parking provision is inadequate; use of lease agreements to limit control of parking to apartments is a spurious approach to managing demand for parking.
- The approach to assessment of the significance of heritage assets and the harm which results to those assets as a consequence of this development is erroneous and does not follow recognised best practice.
- The proposals are woefully inadequate in terms of provision for people with disability.
- The balance of public benefit against the moderate harm identified in the officers report does not provide a convincing case in favour of the development.
- The development is contrary to the Councils residential amenity standards

A letter has been submitted by John Groves Planning from **Disabled Living** (A charity which supports disabled adults, children & older people) – The group considers that the proposed properties fall short of appropriate accessible features and that improvements can be made including appropriately sized parking spaces, introduction of lifts and improving internal dimensions. Concern that the step free access to the Railway Station is being lost.

A letter has been received from **The Environment Practice**, a solicitor representing the Forward Property Group, described in the letter as a company with numerous interests in Hale and the wider area of Trafford. They are known to have links to the Hale Community Trust.

The letter firstly raises concerns about the public procurement process by which the Council has sought a partner for the redevelopment of the Brown Street Car Park. As described in the main report, this is not material to the consideration of the planning application.

It then goes on to raise three representations in respect of the main officer report (OR) summarised as follows:-

1) The planning application seeks permission for a 'public car park' but there is no mechanism in planning conditions to ensure that the car park is publicly available into the future. It requests details of the legal means by which this 'important public resource' will be kept as a public car park in the event planning permission is granted.
2) Details are requested of the legal mechanism by which the recycling of receipts from the staircasing of shared ownership properties can be secured and invested into other affordable housing in Trafford.
3) The letter seeks confirmation of the legal means by which the terms of the planning condition securing affordable housing (Condition 3) will be monitored and enforced. Concern is raised that the officer report does not discuss the exceptional circumstances required by the NPPG to justify a

condition the effect of which is to require the execution of a separate legal agreement.

In response:-

1) The reference to a 'public car park' is in the description of development and the facilities shown on approved plans which are benefits of the scheme would be secured by Condition 2. A materially different proposal would therefore require a different planning application to be approved. The Council will retain its interest in the land and manage the car park on completion. It is the Council's stated intention to maintain the car park for public use but nevertheless any subsequent closure / privatisation of the car park would be subject to public consultation outside of the planning process. There is no planning mechanism by which the car park is currently secured for public use. Planning conditions need to meet the six tests set out in the NPPG, including of necessity and relevance to planning, and should not duplicate other legislation. There is clear community support for maintaining a public parking facility in this location but strictly in planning terms, given the evidence in respect of parking capacity in Hale, there is no reason to do so through the planning process. A condition would therefore not meet the tests set out in the NPPG.
2) The following should be read in conjunction with Paragraph 19 of the main report. There is no legal mechanism by which the receipts from the staircasing of shared ownership properties can be secured. This is reported in Paragraph 210 of the main report, and furthermore is acknowledged as a departure from the development plan (specifically Policy L2.15). Advice in the NPPG is that where a matter can be controlled by condition, this should be used in preference to a S106 agreement. Affordable housing can be secured by condition and no S106 agreement is proposed. However, the main report in Paragraphs 220 – 222 then carries out the necessary exercise where there is a departure from development plan policy, giving appropriate weight to that policy and the NPPF, and concludes that there are material considerations which justify this departure.
3) Condition 3, relating to affordable housing, will be monitored and enforced in the same way as would any planning condition. If there is a breach of the condition, appropriate action would be taken under the Planning Acts. The condition does not require the execution of a legal agreement.

Two individual letters have been received that have been sent directly to members of the planning committee outlining concerns over the proposed development and are considered as direct lobbying of members regarding the proposed development. In addition Hale Community Trust and Hale Civic Society have circulated a package of images to members of the planning committee. These images have not been accurately produced to any verified standard and significantly overstate the impact of the development.

**CONSULTATIONS**

**Environment Agency:-** All SUDS schemes should be designed in accordance with the guidance provided in the CIRIA SUDS Manual and in such a manner as

to incorporate sufficient stages of treatment appropriate to the type of catchment being drained and the sensitivity of the receiving environment. It is also particularly important to ensure that discharges and soakaways are not located in areas that may be subject to contamination, and it must be ensured that the method of discharge does not create new pathways for pollutants to enter groundwater or cause the mobilisation of contaminants already in the ground.

**Lead Local Flood Authority:-** Following discussion with United Utilities it is accepted that infiltration is not viable at this site. The proposed development will only be acceptable if the following measures as detailed in the Drainage Strategy submitted with this application and subsequent correspondence are incorporated in an acceptable surface water drainage scheme, to be secured by way of a planning condition on any planning permission.

**United Utilities:-** United Utilities have considered the proposal and have raised an objection to the proposal with regards the applicants proposal to discharge surface water to the combined sewer. It is considered that insufficient evidence has been submitted to justify the discharge of surface water to the combined sewer.

**Network Rail:-** Network Rail have been in discussions with the applicant and are still reviewing construction plans supplied to them by the applicant and as such had requested that a holding objection on the application be extended to until such time as they have considered the construction detail. In addition they are also reviewing deeds to the station and station car park with regards any historic covenants regarding provision of disabled parking and access and have requested an extension to their initial holding objection.

**OBSERVATIONS**

DESIGN, SITING AND SCALE OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The applicant has confirmed that the proposed external material to the car-park deck enclosure along the northern and eastern boundaries of the building will comprise aluminium rectangular box section in a suggested bronze finish. The original submitted details proposed a galvanised finish. A specific condition has been attached to ensure that details of the fin and a sample of the material is submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority (LPA), this will ensure that the LPA have control over the final detail of the material to ensure that it has a non-reflective appearance.

IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

A representation has questioned the suitability of the first floor rear bedroom area. The bedroom will have a section of glazed ceiling providing light with a small external patio area which will also have a source of light from an open aperture above, the patio area will be partly enclosed with the bridge access from dining area to the rear second floor garden deck. Whilst this source of light through a glazed ceiling is an unconventional arrangement it is considered that the glazed ceiling and the area of natural light from the patio area will provide sufficient natural light to the bedroom.

Other issues raised with regards residential amenity are considered to have been addressed in the main report to committee.

OTHER ISSUES
Concern has been raised in respect of the robustness of survey and other data officers rely on in coming to their conclusions. All the survey evidence referred to in the report is considered to be robust and well founded, and surveys undertaken in a proportionate and reasonable way.

Network Rail - It is considered appropriate that a condition be attached to ensure that no development work shall take place unless and until full details of proposed ground works and construction works adjacent to Network Rail land have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Network Rail. This approach ensures that the applicant must have the approval from Network Rail with regards any works adjacent to their boundary for development to proceed. With regards the issue of historic deeds/covenants these are not material planning considerations and are therefore afforded little weight. Network Rail have no powers to insist on a holding objection, and in any event one of the issues they raise is not material to this application. As appropriate mitigation can be secured by condition, and the NPPG recommends this approach, it is not considered the Network Rail objection should prevent planning permission being granted.

Disabled Ramp and Temporary Parking Spaces – A condition has been attached to request final details of a disabled ramp at Hale station during construction works. This ramp would extend across the entire width of the pavement but could be ramped at both ends with a landing providing level access to the station building so pedestrians can continue to use the pavement. Following discussions with Parking Services a new disabled parking bay can be allocated within Victoria Road car-park without losing an existing space and that another space can be allocated on-street. These spaces would be temporary for the duration of the construction works. An appropriate condition is attached to ensure such details are submitted for consideration and approval by the Local Planning Authority.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Condition 19 **–** To be **replaced with:**
No development shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is first occupied / brought into use. The scheme to be submitted shall demonstrate:

- Surface water drainage system(s) designed in accordance with the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (DEFRA, March 2015).

- Limiting the discharge rate generated by all rainfall events up to the 100 year plus 30% (for climate change) critical rain storm to 5.0l/s.

- Provision of surface water run-off attenuation storage in accordance with the requirements specified in 'Science Report SC030219 Rainfall Runoff Management for Developments'.
- Detailed design (plans, network details and calculations) in support of any surface water drainage scheme, including details on any attenuation system, and the outfall arrangements. Calculations should demonstrate the performance of the designed system for a range of return periods and storm durations inclusive of the 1 in 1 year, 1 in 2 year, 1 in 30 year, 1 in 100 year and 1 in 100 year plus climate change return periods.
- Plans illustrating flooded areas and flow paths in the event of exceedance of the drainage system.
- Provision of an acceptable management and maintenance plan for surface water drainage to ensure that surface water drainage systems shall be maintained and managed for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site in accordance with Policy L5 of the adopted Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Condition 22 - The development hereby approved shall not take place unless and until a scheme detailing a temporary ramp access at Hale Station has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before any works take place on site which restrict disabled access to the platform and shall be retained for the duration of the construction works.

Reason: In the interest of accessibility having regard to Core Strategy Policy L7 and advice contained within the NPPF.

Condition 23: Prior to works taking place on site a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) shall be introduced on the west side of Brown Street opposite the application site to restrict the parking of any vehicle in order to allow construction traffic to access and egress the application site during the approved days and hours of construction activity. The TTRO shall remain in place until all construction activity has ceased on site.

Reason: Mitigation is required prior to commencement in the interests of highway safety and to protect the amenity of residents, having regard to Trafford Core Strategy Policies L4 and L7 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 27: The development hereby approved shall not take place unless and until a scheme detailing the provision of two additional disabled car-parking spaces (one within Victoria Road car park and one on-street) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before any works take place at the application site and shall be retained until the disabled parking spaces have been provided within the Brown Street car park.

Reason: Alternative disabled parking spaces need to be identified and provided before works commence on the application site in the interests of accessibility having regard to Core Strategy Policy L7 and advice contained within the NPPF.

Condition 28 –No above ground works shall take place until full details and samples of the external vertical fins to the north and east elevations of the proposed car park hereby approved have 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 order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity and to protect the setting of heritage assets having regard to Policy L7 and R1 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 30 – No development shall take place until a Risk Assessment and Method Statement (RAMS) along with details of proposed ground works, excavations, vibro-impact works, construction works and scaffolding for development in relation to Network Rail land shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and any protection measures retained throughout the construction period.

Reason: Having regards to the proximity of Network Rail land in the interest of railway safety and in accordance with Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the NPPF.

**Page 109 95660/FUL/18: Former Rileys Snooker Club, 1D Bridgewater Road, Altrincham**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **SPEAKER(S)** | **AGAINST:** | **Peter Brumby (Neighbour)** |
| | **FOR:** | **Tom Flanagan (Agent)** |

**REPRESENTATIONS**

One further letter of objection has been received since the original Committee Report was published. This raises the following concerns:

- Report refers to parking occupancy rather than ownership
- DCLG car parking research data is from 2001, not 2007
- Car ownership values in Transport Statement and Committee Report refer to urban rather than suburban areas
- Residents' parking and vehicle count data is not referenced
- Parking survey at 'The Bridge' does not meet 'Lambeth Methodology'

- Road widths and on-street parking bays not appraised
- Inadequate swept path analyses
- Report includes personal opinions

DESIGN AND APPEARANCE

1. Concerns have been raised that paragraph 20 of the original Committee Report represents a 'personal opinion'. Paragraphs 17 and 18 of the Report set out the policy context in which issues of design and appearance are assessed. Following on from this, paragraph 20 forms an assessment of the scale and density of the proposed development and clearly explains why the proposal is considered, by Officers, to be acceptable in this respect. It should be noted that the Council does not have any detailed guidance which sets parameters for scale or density in this location, so any assessment will be subjective to some degree, albeit based on the aims of Core Strategy Policy L7 and the NPPF. Officers have taken an informed view of the acceptability of the development in these respects and indeed, paragraph 24 reiterates that regard has been had to relevant local and national planning policies and representations in reaching this conclusion.

HIGHWAY MATTERS

2. The additional representation states that paragraphs 53, 55 and 56 of the original Committee Report incorrectly refer to car ownership levels rather than data relating to parking occupancy. The TRICS data referenced in paragraph 53 does relate to car occupancy rather than ownership, however Officers are satisfied that the conclusions drawn are unaffected, in that this is one piece of evidence which informs the anticipated occupancy levels of the proposed car park. Paragraphs 55 and 56 consider the comparability of The Bridge with the proposed development in terms of likely car ownership and these are therefore correct. The parking surveys also comprise one element of the evidence provided and Officers are satisfied that an appropriate level of detail has been provided in respect of these and the TRICS data.

3. Another concern is that the DCLG research referred to in paragraph 54 of the Committee Report was conducted in 2001 and only published in 2007. The Report makes clear that 2007 was the date of publication and it is entirely appropriate for this date to be referred to. Paragraph 64 of the Report acknowledged that this research is dated and the weight afforded it is limited accordingly.

4. Officers are satisfied that the 'urban' rather than 'suburban' figures within the DCLG research referred to are appropriate, given the high density of the surrounding area and based on the methodology for selecting 'urban' areas within this research. Notwithstanding this, car ownership levels for flats within a 'suburban' area remain at less than one car per unit (0.6-0.8)

and as noted above, the weight afforded this evidence is limited due to its age.

5. A further concern is that the first two surveys conducted at The Bridge apartments did not follow the 'Lambeth methodology' for such surveys. As is made clear in the applicant's Transport Statement *"Following a meeting with TMBC in February 2018, and for robustness, further surveys of the 'Bridge' apartments were commissioned"* and that *"The additional surveys were based on the so-called 'Lambeth' methodology, which is a robust methodology first devised by the London Borough of Lambeth Council"*. Paragraph 57 of the Committee Report clearly sets out the results of all surveys carried out on behalf of the applicant, all of which show an occupancy rate of less than 100 per cent of the number of occupied units, including those following this methodology. The statement provided by the applicant's transport consultant referred to in the letter of objection is intended to demonstrate why 'The Bridge' is a reasonable comparator. The similarities between the Lambeth methodology based figures at The Bridge and Budenberg/Woodfield car parks are clearly set out in paragraph 57 of the Report.

6. The letter of objection raises concerns that the LHA comments fail to acknowledge the useable widths of the local highway, given the presence of parking bays on one side of Wharf Road and Navigation Road. Paragraph 71 of the Committee Report is clear that *"A proposed development cannot reasonably be expected to remedy existing issues which may exist through the planning process and the application scheme is not deemed to worsen the current situation in these respects* [insufficient road widths] *to an extent that would warrant a refusal of planning permission"*. Officers are satisfied that this issue has been appropriately addressed.

7. Regarding the residents' parking and traffic data, it is noted that paragraph 74 of the Committee Report acknowledges that *"The comments made by local residents in relation to highway matters have been considered…and the 'residual cumulative impacts' are not considered to be 'severe'"* and this includes the submitted data, which the LHA has had sight of. The vehicle count data represents what is considered by many residents to be an existing issue on the surrounding highway network and as has been made clear above and in the Committee Report, it is not the responsibility of the developer to address these existing issues through the planning process. The conclusions of paragraph 71 in the original report therefore remain valid.

8. Although the proposed vehicular access will be a short distance to the west of the existing access point, accessibility to the site is not considered to be affected to a significant degree, particularly given that there are marked parking bays opposite both the existing and proposed access points. On this basis and given the conclusions that the anticipated

number of vehicular trips to and from the site will not increase to a substantial degree and may even be decrease in comparison to the site's existing lawful use, it remains the case that the proposed access arrangements are considered to be acceptable.

9. For clarity, it is noted that the use of the car park originally serving the Budenberg development by residents of Woodfield apartments was permitted under application ref. H/69498 and its subsequent renewal, ref. 77508/RENEWAL/2011. This is a shared car park serving residents of both developments.

**CONCLUSION**

10. The additional representation has been addressed appropriately above and Officers are satisfied that the recommendation within the original Committee Report remains valid.

**Page 149 95823/FUL/18: Land At Higher House Farm, Dairyhouse Lane Altrincham**

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:**

**FOR: Mrs Donna Barber (Agent)**

**ANALYSIS**

Crime Prevention

An automated barrier is proposed to be located at the vehicular entrance to the site, to prevent unauthorised access to the site. CCTV is also proposed to be located within the car park as an additional security measure. The CCTV will be monitored by security staff at the main Cartwright facility. This matter is addressed in condition 5 which is reworded below.

Biodiversity

Condition 15 is reworded to include bat nesting facilities.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The following conditions are proposed to be amended:

5. The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless and until a Car Park Management Plan, which should include details of car parking space allocation (including spaces to staff with disabilities), control of site access, security measures, how the car park will be managed to minimise impacts on the local residential amenity by users and enforcement of the Plan, has been submitted to and approved in writing by

the Local Planning Authority. On or before first use of the development hereby permitted the Car Park Management Plan shall be implemented and thereafter shall continue to be implemented in perpetuity.

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

15. Bird and bat nesting facilities shall be provided prior to the car park being brought into use in accordance with the details set out in section 8 of the 'Design and Access Statement' produced by OPEN and received by the Local Planning Authority on the 14th November 2018, and retained thereafter.
Reason: In order to enhance and protect the biodiversity and conservation value of the site having regard to Policy R2 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**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**

This page is intentionally left blank