Public Document Pack

AGENDA PAPERS FOR

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Date: Thursday, 13 June 2019

Time: 6.30 pm

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

AGENDA **ITEM**

9. **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT**

To consider the attached report of the Head of Planning and Development, tabled at the meeting. 9

SARA TODD
Chief Executive

Membership of the Committee

Councillors L. Walsh (Chair), A.J. Williams (Vice-Chair), Dr. K. Barclay, D. Bunting, T. Carey, M. Cordingley, D. Jerrome, M. Minnis, D. Morgan, E. Patel, K. Procter, E.W. Stennett and B.G. Winstanley.

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 9

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 13th June 2019

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	For
94928	Development Site Adjacent to Chatsworth House, 6 Stanhope Road, Bowdon, WA14 3JY	Bowdon	1	✓	
95832	84 Arcadia Avenue, Sale, M33 3RZ	Timperley	26		
96417	300 Manchester Road Altrincham, WA14 5NB	Broadheath	34	✓	✓
96671	33 Gaddum Road, Bowdon, WA14 3PF	Bowdon	44		✓
96944	Dovecote Business Park, Old Hall Road, Sale, M33 2GS	Sale Moor	54		✓

Page 1 94928/FUL/18: Development Site Adjacent To Chatsworth House, 6 Stanhope Road, Bowdon

SPEAKER(S)	**AGAINST:**	**Dr Z Rab Alvi (Neighbour)**
	FOR:	

Page 34 96417/COU/18: 300 Manchester Road, Altrincham

SPEAKER(S)	**AGAINST:**	**Mr Ian Betts (Neighbour)**
	FOR:	**Charles Pearson (Agent)**

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of objection have been received from six addresses with reference to the corrected development description. Five of these had objected at the time of the original consultation whilst one came from a new address.

In addition, a letter from the local MP was also received which emphasised the concerns of constituents.

Most comments received are similar to those received in response to the initial neighbour consultation exercise; the responses to which are summarised and addressed where relevant in the committee report. The new issues raised are addressed in the 'Observations' section below insofar as they are relevant to the application.

Issues previously raised

- Parking arrangements are inadequate and will cause highway safety concerns for vehicles entering Claremont Drive from Manchester Road. Claremont Road is a private road so there is no right for others to park on it.
- Businesses don't belong in a residential area. It's inappropriate for a care home to be attached to a residential property.
- There have been anti-social behaviour problems around the site in the past.
- TPOs cover Claremont Drive.
- The change of use will exacerbate issues already caused by college students.
- There are families with young children nearby and the change of use would be a risk to them.

- There is already a care home in the area and it is not appropriate to place two children's homes next to one another.
- The site was previously used to house young offenders without considering the impact on the care use at no. 298.

New issues

- Appearance- Grass verges are left looking untidy, a boundary wall is in need of replacement and there is litter at the site.
- Questions have been raised about how the care home will be managed.

OBSERVATIONS

The applicant has clarified that the site has been vacant for the last approximately 6 months whilst awaiting the outcome of this planning application. It is considered likely that bringing the site back into active use would help to address concerns with untidiness at the site. These particular issues raised with the appearance of the site, primarily relating to a general untidiness, do not provide planning grounds for the refusal of the application.

This planning application relates to the principle of whether it is appropriate to use the property as a care home for young care leavers and unaccompanied asylum seekers. There is other legislation that would control the management of the care home and it is not within the scope of this application to determine who should manage the facility or to seek to control the day to day management of the accommodation. In granting planning permission, it is the use of the land and buildings which is being considered and case law has established that in making a planning decision, it should be assumed that other regulatory regimes will operate effectively, and that the planning permission should not seek to duplicate these controls.

Page 44 96671/HHA/19: 33 Gaddum Road, Bowdon

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

FOR: Akeel Rahmatalla (Applicant)

REPRESENTATIONS

2no. emails received following amended plans being notified to neighbouring residents.
Comments include:

- Appreciation of compromises proposed and effort from planning department reaching this position.

- The current boundary base wall has a maximum height of 1.27m not 0.99m as stated; and the pillars have a maximum height of 2.13m, not 1.93m as stated.
- Pleased with gate width being reduced to 5m but disappointed that style will be similar to No.29 and not of previous 33GR-SK6h design.
- The retained pillar acting as a “book-end” is not directly adjacent to the boundary with No.1 Little Meadow Road, but falls halfway along No.33 Gaddum Road’s side boundary. Questions whether there is any intention to alter the brick wall and replace with extended rendered wall.
- Requests report to be amended to read “"*...before returning to approx. 0.6m where it meets the existing brick wall and fence along the remaining side boundary of the site".*

OBSERVATIONS

Whilst the Proposal section refers to the existing base wall being a height of 0.99m and the existing pillars being 1.93m, it is accepted that the maximum heights of the base wall and pillars are 1.27m and 2.13m as specified in the above representation as the ground level varies along the frontages of the site.

It is also accepted that the retained pillar on the Little Meadow Road frontage falls halfway along 33 Gaddum Road’s frontage rather than adjacent to the boundary with No. 1 Little Meadow Road. The wording of paragraph 8 is therefore amended to read as follows: -

The current application, as amended, seeks planning consent for the reduction in height of the existing base wall to a height, when measured immediately adjacent to No.31 Gaddum Road, of 0.6m. The wall would be level in height with a maximum height of approximately 1m due to the topography at the junction with Little Meadow Road returning to approximately 0.6m where it meets the existing brick wall and fence along the remaining side boundary of the site".

For the avoidance of doubt, the application does not propose the extension of the rendered wall to replace the brick wall on the remainder of the Little Meadow Road frontage.

In relation to the proposed conditions, the Planning Compliance Team Leader has advised that the most effective means of enforcement in this particular case is to delete the existing Conditions 1 and 4, use an Enforcement Notice if necessary, and seek compliance with the landscaping condition on the original permission for the house remodelling (86820/HHA/15).

Condition 1 currently requires the existing boundary wall and piers to be reduced in height and repainted / treated in accordance with the approved plans within four months of the date of the permission. It is therefore recommended that this condition is deleted and replaced by the standard three year time limit condition and that the timing of the required alterations to the boundary treatment should be a matter for the Planning Enforcement Team to pursue.

In addition, it is recommended that Condition 4 is deleted and that the landscaping should also be a matter for the Planning Enforcement Team to pursue through the condition on the original permission.

RECOMMENDATION

That the previously recommended Condition 1 is deleted and replaced as follows:

1. The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

That Condition 4 is deleted.

Page 54 96944/FUL/19: Dovecote Business Park, Old Hall Road, Sale

SPEAKER(S)	**AGAINST:**	
	FOR:	**Janet Rowley (Agent)**

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