



**AGENDA PAPERS FOR
PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

Date: Thursday, 9 July 2015

Time: 6.30 pm

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

AGENDA	ITEM
1. ATTENDANCES	
To note attendances, including Officers and any apologies for absence.	
2. MINUTES	
To receive and, if so determined, to approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on 11 th June, 2015.	2
3. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT	
To consider a report of the Head of Planning Services, to be tabled at the meeting.	
4. APPLICATIONS FOR PERMISSION TO DEVELOP ETC.	
To consider the attached reports of the Head of Planning Services.	4
5. URGENT BUSINESS (IF ANY)	
Any other item or items which by reason of special circumstances (to be specified) the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion should be considered at this meeting as a matter of urgency.	

THERESA GRANT
Chief Executive

Planning Development Control Committee - Thursday, 9 July 2015

Membership of the Committee

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

Further Information

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

Michelle Cody, Democratic & Scrutiny Officer

Tel: 0161 912 2775

Email: michelle.cody@trafford.gov.uk

This agenda was issued on **Tuesday, 30 June 2015** by the Legal and Democratic Services Section, Trafford Council, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford M32 0TH.

Any person wishing to photograph, film or audio-record a public meeting are requested to inform Democratic Services in order that necessary arrangements can be made for the meeting.

Please contact the Democratic Services Officer 48 hours in advance of the meeting if you intend to do this or have any queries.

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

11th JUNE, 2015

PRESENT:

Councillor Mrs. Ward (In the Chair),
Councillors Dr. Barclay, Mrs. Brophy (Substitute) (Part), Bunting, N. Evans, Gratrix,
Hopps, Malik, O'Sullivan, Smith, Walsh and Whetton.

In attendance: Head of Planning Services (Mr. R. Haslam),
Development Control Manager (Mr. D. Pearson),
Senior Planner (Mrs. A. Doow-Powell),
Planner (Mr. B. Bechka),
Planner (Mr. I. Gulfraz) (Part),
Highways Officer (Mr. G. Williamson),
Solicitor (Mrs. C. Kefford),
Democratic & Scrutiny Officer (Miss M. Cody).

Also present: Councillors Stephen Anstee, Holden and Denise Western.

APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Fishwick and Mrs. Reilly.

1. MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

RESOLVED: That the Membership of the Planning Development Control Committee for the Municipal Year 2015/2016 be noted.

2. APPOINTMENT OF SUB-COMMITTEE

Members of the Planning Development Control Committee were asked to appoint the Planning Development Control (Tree Preservation Order) Sub-Committee.

RESOLVED: That the Planning Development Control (Tree Preservation Order) Sub-Committee be appointed comprising the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Opposition Spokesperson or their nominees.

3. APPOINTMENT OF SUB-COMMITTEE

Members of the Planning Development Control Committee were asked to appoint the Town/Village Green Sub-Committee.

RESOLVED: That the Town/Village Green Sub-Committee be appointed comprising the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Opposition Spokesperson or their nominees.

Planning Development Control Committee
11th June, 2015

4. TERMS OF REFERENCE

RESOLVED: That the Terms of Reference for the Planning Development Control Committee be noted.

5. MEETING DATES

RESOLVED: That the scheduled meeting dates for the Planning Development Control Committee for the Municipal Year 2015/2016 be noted.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 14th May, 2015, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

7. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT

The Head of Planning Services submitted a report informing Members of additional information received regarding applications for planning permission to be determined by the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the report be received and noted.

8. APPLICATIONS FOR PERMISSION TO DEVELOP ETC.

(a) Permission granted subject to standard conditions prescribed by statute, if any, and to any other conditions now determined

<u>Application No., Name of Applicant, Address or Site</u>	<u>Description</u>
83363/VAR/2014 – Brookmoor Developments Ltd – 31-33 Gloucester Road, Urmston.	Variation of Condition 1 (parking provision and layout) of planning permission 78051/FULL/2012 (erection of new building containing 10 no. apartments) to reduce the number of off-street parking spaces associated with the building to six.
84508/FUL/14 – Altin Homes – Park House, 73 Northenden Road, Sale.	Proposed demolition of 71 and 73 Northenden Road, Sale to allow for the construction of 24 no. new residential dwellings with associated roads, parking and landscape works.
84653/FUL/15 – The Trustees of Newstead Evangelical Church – Newstead Church, Newstead Terrace, Timperley.	Change of use from church building to a mixed use building used for emergency homeless provision and continued use as a place of worship.

Planning Development Control Committee
11th June, 2015

(b) Application deferred

Application No., Name of Applicant, Address or Site

Description

84541/FUL/14 – Mr. Offland – 61 Bankhall Lane, Hale Barns.

Proposed demolition of existing dwelling to allow erection of a replacement three storey dwelling set within sunken garden area. Alterations to existing access with landscaping works throughout.

[Consideration of Application 84541/FUL/14 was deferred to enable the issues raised in the late representations received to be fully addressed.]

9. **APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION 82896/FULL/2014 – HAMPSTEAD LAND LIMITED – LAND AT ROTHESAY CRESCENT, SALE**

The Head of Planning Services submitted a report concerning an application for planning permission for the erection of 2 no. detached dwellinghouses with associated car parking and landscaping.

It was moved and seconded that planning permission be refused.

The motion was put to the vote and declared lost.

RESOLVED –

- (A) That the application will propose a satisfactory form of development for the site upon the completion of an appropriate Legal Agreement to secure the remaining area of open space for long term public use, alongside two one off contributions from the land owner of £6,655 for improvement works to local open space and £18,173 for future maintenance of the open space, together with an on-going monthly maintenance figure payable to the Council until the point of formal transfer.
- (B) In the circumstances where the S106 Agreement has not been completed within 3 months of the resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Head of Planning Services.
- (C) That upon the satisfactory completion of the above Legal Agreement, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions now determined.

10. **APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION 84703/FUL/15 – PHD1 LTD – MKM HOUSE, WARWICK ROAD, STRETFORD**

The Head of Planning Services submitted a report concerning an application for planning permission for the erection of 12 storey building with three basement levels to provide 89 apartments, basement car parking, cycle parking facilities, associated landscaping and vehicular access from Warwick Road.

Planning Development Control Committee
11th June, 2015

RESOLVED –

- (A) That the application will propose a satisfactory form of development for the site upon the completion of an appropriate Legal Agreement to secure a maximum financial contribution of £51,381 towards improvements to Gorse Hill Park comprising: £22,202 towards Local Open Space and £29,179 towards play provision.
- (B) In the circumstances where the S106 Agreement has not been completed within three months of the resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Head of Planning Services.
- (C) That upon the satisfactory completion of the above Legal Agreement, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions now determined.

11. APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION 84970/VAR/15 – MR. D. LYONS – DERWENT CONSTRUCTION LTD – LAND AT AND ADJACENT TO WHITE CITY RETAIL PARK, CHESTER ROAD, OLD TRAFFORD

The Head of Planning Services submitted a report concerning an application for the variation of Conditions 2 and 3 of planning permission H/68876 in order to allow for sub-division (changes to drawings approved under Condition 2) and to allow the sale of open A1 goods from within Unit 1 (amendment to Condition 3).

RESOLVED –

- (A) That the application will propose a satisfactory form of development for the site upon the completion of an appropriate Legal Agreement/Undertaking to restrict the sale or display of convenience goods from Unit H2 and from Units I or H simultaneously; and to vary the original S106 Agreement as appropriate.
- (B) In the circumstances where the S106 Agreement/Undertaking has not been completed within three months of this resolution, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Head of Planning Services.
- (C) That upon the satisfactory completion of the above Legal Agreement/Undertaking, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions now determined.

12. APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION 85430/HHA/15 – MR. OAKES – 216 BROOKLANDS ROAD, SALE

The Head of Planning Services submitted a report concerning an application for planning permission for the demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of a single storey rear, first floor side extension and the erection of a front door canopy. (Resubmission of Application No. 84829/HHA/15).

RESOLVED: That the decision be delegated for determination by the Head of Planning Services following the submission of amended plans and the withdrawal of the call-in request made by Councillor Mrs. Evans.

Planning Development Control Committee
11th June, 2015

13. SECTION 106 AND CIL UPDATE: OCTOBER 2014 – MARCH 2015

The Head of Planning Services submitted a report informing Members about the latest set of monitoring data for S106 Agreements and CIL notices.

RESOLVED: That the contents of the report be noted.

14. PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS UPDATE: APRIL 2014 – MARCH 2015

The Head of Planning Services submitted a report informing Members about the appeal decisions received over the last year.

RESOLVED: That the contents of the report be noted.

The meeting commenced at 6.30 p.m. and concluded at 8.58 p.m.

This page is intentionally left blank



PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 9th JULY 2015

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES

APPLICATIONS FOR PERMISSION TO DEVELOP, ETC.

PURPOSE

To consider applications for planning permission and related matters to be determined by the Committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As set out in the individual reports attached.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

None unless specified in an individual report.

STAFFING IMPLICATIONS

None unless specified in an individual report.

PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

None unless specified in an individual report.

Further information from: Mr. Rob Haslam, Head of Planning Services
Proper Officer for the purposes of the L.G.A. 1972, s.100D (Background papers): Mr. Rob Haslam, Head of Planning Services

Background Papers:

In preparing the reports on this agenda the following documents have been used:

1. The Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy.
2. The GM Joint Waste Development Plan Document.
3. The GM Joint Minerals Development Plan Document.
4. The Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (2006).
5. Supplementary Planning Documents specifically referred to in the reports.
6. Government advice (National Planning Policy Framework, Circulars, practice guidance etc.).
7. The application file (as per the number at the head of each report).
8. The forms, plans, committee reports and decisions as appropriate for the historic applications specifically referred to in the reports.
9. Any additional information specifically referred to in each report.

These Background Documents are available for inspection at Planning and Building Control, 1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, Manchester M32 0TH.

TRAFFORD METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 9th July 2015

Report of the Head of Planning Services

INDEX OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMISSION TO DEVELOPMENT etc. PLACED ON THE AGENDA FOR DECISION BY THE COMMITTEE

Applications for Planning Permission				
Application	Site Address/Location of Development	Ward	Page	Recommendation
82164	Davenport Green Hall, Shay Lane, Hale Barns, WA15 8UD	Hale Barns	1	Grant
83507	Southbank & Delamer Lodge, 1-2 Cavendish Road, Altrincham, WA14 2NJ	Bowdon	12	Grant
84566	Priory Nursery, 159 Dane Road, Sale, M33 2NG	Priory	26	Grant
84644	63 Woodhouse Road, Davyhulme, M41 7NT	Davyhulme West	33	Grant
84968	Mitford Lodge, 90 Mitford Street, Stretford, M32 8AQ	Stretford	38	Grant
84979	Mitford Lodge, 90 Mitford Street, Stretford, M32 8AQ	Stretford	51	Grant
85007	Land between Grosvenor House & 11A Goose Green, Back Grafton Street, Altrincham, WA14 1DW	Altrincham	65	Minded to Grant
85049	1-20 The Green, Whitley Gardens, Timperley, WA15 6XE	Village	80	Grant
85149	7 Riddings Road, Hale, WA15 9DS	Hale Central	87	Minded to Grant
85167	226 Washway Road, Sale, M33 4RA	St Mary's	99	Grant
85620	253 Washway Road, Sale, M33 4BL	Brooklands	109	Grant
85931	190-192 Flixton Road, Flixton, M41 5DR	Urmston	118	Grant

WARD: HALE BARNES

82164/COU/2014

DEPARTURE: No

Continued mixed use of building to accommodate functions including weddings/civil ceremonies (with food provision) and continued residential use as a single dwelling.

Davenport Green Hall, Shay Lane, Hale Barns, WA15 8UD

APPLICANT: Mr Isaq

AGENT: Hall Needham Associates

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

SITE

The site is located on the south side of Shay Lane in Hale Barns (approximately 1.3km to the north-east of Hale Barns local centre) and occupies a site extending to approximately 4 hectares, located within the Green Belt. The site comprises a two storey Grade II listed house known as Davenport Green Hall with two large detached outbuildings adjacent to the main house which are referred to as 'The Lodge' and 'The Cheshire Barn'. The Hall originates from 1617 and has had a further wing added in the 18th/19th Century and has more recently had an extension added to the western elevation in the early 1980's. The buildings are surrounded by extensive lawned areas to the western, north-west and north-east sides of the site.

The Lodge is currently used for both ancillary accommodation to Davenport Green Hall and also as the main office for the running of the business at the site. The Lodge is a single storey structure with a pitched slate roof and white render finish with black painted detail on the front and rear elevations. Planning permission was granted in October 2009 for the mixed use of the Lodge as residential/office use Planning Ref:H/71170. The Cheshire Barn is positioned adjacent to the Lodge; this building is also a single storey structure with pitched tiled roof and similar external finish to that of The Lodge. The Cheshire Barn has had planning permission for conversion from ancillary residential to hosting wedding and similar functions (planning ref H/66693) approved in January 2008. These two outbuildings were previously barns to the main dwelling house which had originally been known as Davenport Green Hall Farm.

The site has extensive grounds sharing a boundary with Shay Lane to the north, Roaring Gate Lane to the east, Ringway Golf Club land to the west of the site and Brooks Drive to the south of the site which is an unadopted and unmade highway. Boundaries to the site consist of mature trees and soft landscaping aside from the western boundary with Ringway Golf Club which has an open aspect; boundary treatment consists of a rural style timber post and rail fence. The Brooks Drive boundary has a 2m high palisade fence along the majority of this extensive boundary.

Further along the boundary near to the Roaring Gate Lane junction is a section of 2m high closed timber panel fencing which is also unauthorised. A belt of trees along the Brooks Drive boundary within the site are protected by a 'blanket' Tree Preservation Order (TPO 175)

The main vehicular entrance to the site is from Shay Lane with a gravel drive leading up to the main hall. To the rear of the Cheshire Barn is an area of car-parking which has a coarse compacted gravel surface. Another vehicular access exists onto Brooks Drive from the site, which has brick gate piers and wrought iron vehicular gates clad in metal panels, both approximately 2m-2.5m high with gates painted green.

PROPOSAL

This application seeks approval for the use of Davenport Green Hall (the Hall) for hosting functions such as weddings whilst retaining its residential use. The hosting of weddings and such functions complements the wider use of the site for such activities, following the approval in 2008 for the use of the Cheshire Barn as a venue for hosting weddings. The use of the Hall for hosting ceremonies in association with the lawful use of the site has commenced.

The Hall has two rooms which would be utilised for hosting functions; the Historic Room which can accommodate approximately 80 guests for a sit down meal or 100 standing. The second room is the White Lounge which can accommodate approximately 130 guests standing or up to approximately 50 sitting. No food is prepared within the Hall, with outside caterers used to provide food for functions.

Parking provision on site is the lawful car-parking area located to the rear of the Cheshire Barn and can accommodate 50 car-parking spaces. The spaces are not demarcated on site but have been demonstrated on plan.

Condition 10 of Planning approval H/66693 which granted use of the Cheshire Barn for hosting functions restricted use of the vehicular access to the site to be via Shay Lane only due to highway safety concerns.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**, adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.

- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 1st April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2013 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L4 – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

L7 – Design

L8 – Planning Obligations

R1 – Historic Environment

R2 – Natural Environment

R3 – Green Infrastructure

R4 – Green Belt, Countryside and Other Protected Open Land

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

Green Belt

Wildlife Corridor

Protection of Landscape Character

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

C4 – Green Belt

ENV10 – Wildlife Corridors

ENV17 – Areas of Landscape Protection

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

(most recent)

Davenport Green Hall

84892/FUL/15 - Proposed mixed use of site for airport car-parking in association with its continued use for functions (weddings & similar) and residential use – Refused June 2015

83210/CLOPD/2014 – Certificate of Proposed Lawful Use or Development for a temporary marquee and catering tent at Davenport Green Hall, Shay Lane, Hale – Approved June 2015

H/71300 – Retention of marquee for hosting private functions for a period of 18 months (with ancillary toilet and storage facilities and landscaping). Use of Brooks Drive for egress only – Withdrawn 12/10/2009

H/70696 – Retention of palisade fencing to Brooks Drive boundary and wooden plyboard fencing to Shay Lane boundary – Withdrawn 21/07/2009

The Lodge

H/71170 – Change of use from residential to mixed use residential and offices at 'The Lodge' outbuilding, Davenport Green Hall – Approved 20/10/2009.

The Cheshire Barn

H/66693 – Change of use of outbuilding from residential to hosting wedding ceremonies and similar functions with associated car parking and landscaping and part single storey side/rear extension and external changes to façade of outbuilding – Approved 25/01/2008.

RELEVANT ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

Enforcement Case Number ENF1352 - Enforcement Notice dated the 21st July 2010; the owner of the site appealed against the enforcement notice requiring removal of a marquee and associated structures from land at Davenport Green Hall. Public Inquiry held on 12th April 2011 – 15th April 2011. Decision to dismiss the appeal dated 17th May 2011. The owner then sought to challenge the Planning Inspector's decision which was heard in the High Court on the 19th and 20th October 2011. The outcome was that the High Court judge dismissed the legal challenge, thereby supporting the enforcement notice. The owner then subsequently submitted an application in November 2011 seeking leave to challenge this decision at the Court of Appeal which was also dismissed on the 8th May 2012. The Council successfully prosecuted the owner of the site early 2014 for a continual breach of the notice following the failure of his court appeals. The unauthorised marquee and associated structures have been removed from site; the requirements of the Enforcement Notice have now been complied with.

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has submitted a Heritage Statement which will be referred to as necessary within this report

CONSULTATIONS

Pollution, Housing & Licensing (Noise) – No objections subject to the following condition being attached to any grant of planning permission:-

The applicant should appoint a noise consultant (or suitably qualified building surveyor) to inspect the building and report on the acoustic integrity of the building in terms of the

potential for noise breakout. The assessment shall identify all noise attenuation measures determined appropriate to reduce the impact of noise nuisance upon nearby residential properties to achieve the requirements of BS8233 'Sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings – Code of practice', for internal noise levels within dwellings. Details of all mitigation measures proposed should be submitted and approved by the Council in advance of any works.

Local Highway Authority – No objections

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbours:- 10 Letters of objection have been received regarding this application, citing the following concerns:-

Amenity

- Loud music played at events
- Helicopters have landed at this site
- Drums and DJ/PA announcements audible
- Drunk revellers trespassing on neighbours property
- Waste/litter scattered around site and neighbouring roads
- Applicant has been recently prosecuted for an illegal marquee
- Noise from cars late at night
- The Listed Building is less susceptible to sound proofing

Highways

- Any permission should be conditioned to no more than 50 cars on site at any one time.
- Queues of traffic have extended from the site onto the highway
- Shay Lane is a residential street not suitable for commercial use
- Cars have used residents drives to undertake manoeuvres
- Inadequate parking on the site
- Vehicular access to Shay Lane is limited in size, large buses and coaches have struggled to manoeuvre into the site
- Traffic has used Brooks Drive which has a dangerous bend onto Thorley Lane
- Coaches have parked on Shay Lane blocking visibility of road users
- Some external lights removed from site boundaries as it was causing a glare to drivers

General

- A condition should be applied to restrict numbers of people using the Hall
- There has been well documented planning issues at this site since 2007
- Any argument that the use is required to fund improvements to the property not accepted, property should be sold

- Identified structural damage to the Hall during the public inquiry means its use may be dangerous

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

1. The proposed mixed use of the hall for hosting wedding and similar functions whilst retaining its residential use is considered acceptable in principle, subject to its appropriateness in relation to Green Belt, Heritage, Residential Amenity and Highways issues.

GREEN BELT

2. National Policy regarding Green Belt is contained within the NPPF. Para.87 of the NPPF states *that 'inappropriate development is, by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in special circumstances.'* The guidance goes on to list (para.90) certain forms of development that are not considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. The proposed development is considered to meet the fourth criterion of those developments which are considered not inappropriate which is *'the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction'*. The proposed mixed use of this building which is currently in use as a residential dwelling therefore satisfies this criterion.
3. The current development plan for the Borough, The Trafford Core Strategy includes policy R4 *Green Belt, Countryside and Other Protected Open Land*, which is the relevant policy when considering development within the Green Belt. The contents of policy R4 reiterate what was previously included in policy C5 *Development in the Green Belt* of the UDP. Policy R4 states: - *R4.1 - The Council will continue to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development. R4.2 New development, including buildings or uses for a temporary period will only be permitted within these areas where it is for one of the appropriate purposes specified in national guidance, where the proposal does not prejudice the primary purposes of the Green Belt set out in national guidance by reason of its scale, siting, materials or design or where very special circumstances can be demonstrated in support of the proposal.* Paragraph 24.2 within Policy R4 of the Core Strategy states *'Within the Green Belt, development will be restricted to those uses that are deemed appropriate in the context of national guidance and which maintain openness. For all other types of development it will be necessary for the applicant to demonstrate very special circumstances to warrant the granting of any planning permission for development.'* As this proposed development is considered to meet the criteria for development not considered as inappropriate, it is not necessary for the applicant to demonstrate any special circumstances. The proposed use of the Hall for mixed use private residential along with hosting functions is considered acceptable

HERITAGE ASSET (LISTED BUILDING)

4. The use of the Hall for the proposed mixed use is seen to be an acceptable use of the historic building and which reflects national and local planning guidance. Advice within the NPPF (para. 131) states that in determining planning applications which have regard to heritage assets, local planning authorities should take account of:
 - *The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
 - *The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*
 - *The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.*
5. Further advice within the NPPF at paragraph 132 recognises that local planning authorities '*when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the assets conservation*'. The building has well documented structural issues especially with the east gable elevation of the building which currently has a temporary supporting frame to prevent it from failing. The owner of the site has had numerous discussions with the Council with regards the stewardship of the building and the wider site and is exploring various options with regards possible funding and sources of income to undertake restoration works.
6. The proposal being considered is the mixed used of the Hall; retaining the private residential use along with the proposed use for functions and specifically the use of the two main ground floor rooms, identified as the Historic Room and the White Lounge. The use of the Hall has been on-going for a period of time and its use does not involve any structural works/additions to the fabric of the existing building. This type of mixed commercial use for such an historic building is not an uncommon use for such rural historic sites and the use proposed is not considered to result in harm the to the character and special interest of the listed building. Facilitating the part commercial use of this building enables the owner to maintain an income stream in conjunction with the use of the Cheshire Barn to help contribute towards restoration works to the building.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

7. The representations received by the residents include numerous incidents of noise and disturbance from the application site. It is however important to recognise that the unauthorised marquee which has now been removed from the site, was the main cause of the disamenity that residents had experienced in the past. The marquee was capable of hosting up to 1500 guests and that scale of activity was considered not acceptable for this site, resulting in the Council undertaking appropriate enforcement action for this and other reasons. This was reflected by the Planning Inspectorate dismissing the appeal to retain the

marquee and subsequent court challenges. The applicant has acknowledged that since the removal of the marquee the wedding business has suffered with bookings down.

8. Whilst the experiences of the residents are important in understanding how the site has operated, this proposal must be considered on its own merits. The proposal involves no extensions or external works to the Hall. The proposal involves the use of the Historic Hall which can accommodate a maximum of 100 guests and the White Lounge can accommodate a maximum of 130 (both these figures for standing guests) figures advertised by the applicant. The existing Cheshire Barn is conditioned to 100 guests; however the applicant has advertised it for accommodating 250 guests. In considering the proposed use of the Hall, it must be considered that the venue could in theory host three separate functions on the same day at the same time, within the Cheshire Barn, the Historic Hall and the White Lounge. In reality and for practical reasons this is unlikely to ever happen. However it would be considered appropriate to apply a condition to ensure that no more than one function can take place within the Hall on the same day and that no event can take place within the Hall on the same day an event is occurring within the Cheshire Barn. This will ensure that the guests to the site are limited appropriately and also ensures sufficient car-parking provision is maintained.
9. The hall is positioned approximately 65m from the boundary with Shay Lane where the nearest residential properties to the site are located (a number of properties are also located to the south west of the site further along Brooks Drive). It is considered that the use of the building for functions will not impact adversely on the nearby residents. Both rooms within the Hall are limited in size and do not provide the space for a dance floor; a condition can be applied to ensure no amplified music to be played during functions within the Hall. The Cheshire Barn has been used for amplified/live music and has the space to facilitate a dance floor. It has also been recommended by the Councils Environmental Protection section that the applicant submits a noise survey to determine the acoustic characteristics of the building and to identify any remedial works which would mitigate any potential noise outbreak.
10. The hours of use are 1800hrs – 0100hrs Monday – Sunday and including Bank Holidays. The use of the Cheshire Barn is conditioned to be used between the hours of 1130hrs – 2000hrs Monday to Wednesday and 1130hrs 2400hrs Thursday to Sunday. It is considered appropriate to retain the existing approved hours of use for this site given the proximity to residential properties.
11. It is considered that the use of the Hall for the proposed development would not result in an adverse impact on residential amenity and that the activity can be controlled by appropriate planning conditions as indicated.

HIGHWAYS

12. The proposed site has parking provision for 50 cars as approved under planning reference H/66693, these spaces are not demarcated on site but have been demonstrated on plan. The parking is located mainly to the rear of the Cheshire Barn with spaces also provided around the Hall and the Lodge. A condition as indicated earlier in this report is to be attached limiting effectively only one of the possible three rooms (i.e the Cheshire Barn, White Lounge and Historic Hall) from operating on any one day. The requirements of this condition will ensure guest numbers are controlled with regards amenity issues and also that parking provision is sufficient on site without the need to extend the parking area.
13. The submitted parking layout plan suggests approximately 53 parking spaces; however three of these spaces to the front elevation of the Cheshire Barn cannot currently be utilised as a section of unauthorised decking has been erected in this location. The applicant has been advised in writing that the decking is unauthorised and requires planning approval and listed building consent.

OTHER ISSUES

14. It has been advertised in the past that the three bedrooms at first floor level have been used in association with functions, such as a bridal suite. No details of such provision has been made and that does not form part of the proposal being considered; the applicant wishes to retain the residential use of the building along with the capacity for hosting functions.
15. The applicant has the potential to erect a marquee which could hold up to a maximum of 400 people, but can be modified to hold either 100, 200, 300 or the maximum of 400 guests. This was established (through the determination of the certificate of lawful proposed development application Ref:83210/CLOPD/2014) not to constitute a building (for purposes of Section 336(1) of the 1990 Act) and was therefore considered not to be development as defined under Section 55(1) of the 1990 Act. That particular structure can only be affixed to the ground through wooden pegs and/or water weights and would have to be removed immediately after an event. The ability to erect such a marquee does not influence the determination of the proposal on its merits.
16. The applicant has been utilising the site since June 2014 for the parking of cars linked to an airport car parking business (not operated by or associated with the Manchester Airport Group). Residents objected to the use and harm to amenity since that use commenced. A planning application seeking approval for such development was refused in early June 2015, and the Council are now considering appropriate enforcement action as the use has continued. Again this element of activity on site cannot influence the consideration of the proposed development even though it restricts parking availability.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

17. This proposal is subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and comes under the category of 'all other' development, consequently the development will be liable to a CIL charge rate of £0 per square metre in line with Trafford's CIL charging schedule and revised SPD1: Planning Obligations (2014).
18. No other planning obligations are required as a result of this proposed development.


RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions

1. Approved Plans
2. The premises to which this relates shall be used for pre-booked/pre-arranged private functions which are by invitation only such as weddings, birthdays, barmitzvah's, anniversaries and small conferences for a maximum of 100 guests and for no other purpose (including any other purpose within Class D2 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).
3. Only one event to be held in within Davenport Green Hall (the White Room or the Historic Room) on any given day and not on the same day that an event is taking place within the Cheshire Barn.
4. Acoustic Survey to be submitted within 2 months of approval
5. No amplified/live music to be used during a function within Davenport Green Hall
6. Use of Shay Lane access only
7. The hours of operation of the use hereby permitted shall be limited to 1130hrs – 2000hrs Monday to Wednesday and 1130hrs – 2400hrs Thursday to Sunday.
8. All traffic associated with the proposed change of use shall enter and leave the site via the vehicular access on Shay Lane only.
9. No function within Davenport Green Hall will be undertaken unless the parking provision as indicated on approved drawing titled 'Car Parking' received 01/03/2015 is fully available for use.

CM



Davenport Green Hall, Shay Lane, Hale Barns (site hatched on plan)



Scale: 1:1,250

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright 2012.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Organisation	Trafford Council
Department	Planning Service
Comments	Committee date 9/07/2015
Date	29/06/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

WARD: Bowdon

83507/FULL/2014

DEPARTURE: No

Change of use and conversion of existing buildings from a nursing home to 17 dwellings (15 x 3 bed roomed and 2 x 4 bed roomed) with associated car parking and landscaping.

Southbank And Delamer Lodge, 1-2 Cavendish Road, Altrincham, WA14 2NJ

APPLICANT: DeTrafford Estates Group

AGENT: Paul Butler Associates

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

SITE

The application concerns a site located on the junction of Cavendish Road, Higher Downs and Delamer Road. The application site is occupied by 3 buildings: Southbank (to the western end of the site closest to the junction of Cavendish Road with Higher Downs), Delamer Lodge (towards the eastern end of the site) and the Coach House (attached to Delamer Lodge in the north-eastern corner of the site). The buildings were originally dwellings but latterly were in use as a nursing home. They are currently vacant.

The wider area primarily comprises housing and the immediate surrounds of the site include residential properties to the north, east and south many of which remain in single ownership. Other notable uses in the surrounding area are education and religion.

There are two current accesses to the application site, the main one being from Cavendish Road with a smaller access onto Higher Downs.

The site is located within the Downs Conservation Area Sub-Area D (As defined in SPD5.5 Oct 2014). There are numerous trees on the site which, whilst not covered by TPO are protected as being within a conservation area.

PROPOSAL

The proposed scheme is to convert Southbank into 9 apartments (8 x 3-bed apartments and 1 x 4 bed apartment), Delamer Lodge, including a replacement rear extension will be converted into 7 apartments (6 x 3 bed apartments and 1 x 4 bed apartment) the Coach House will be converted into a 3 bedroomed town house.

A considerable level of detailed discussion has taken place between the applicants, the Council and local interest groups resulting in numerous amendments to the scheme including the now proposed underground parking area.

In relation to Southbank, it is proposed to demolish an existing rear extension, the existing single storey link between Southbank and Delamer Lodge and a small side extension and to erect a replacement 3 storey rear extension. The modern access arrangements to the building's main entrance are to be removed and together with the re-instatement of the ground levels within the site to establish the original topography a more modest and less visually intrusive access will be provided to Southbank.

In terms of Delamer Lodge the existing rear extension will be re-clad, part of the existing rear single storey extension demolished and part replaced with a contemporary extension, recessed roof balconies added and new access arrangements provided to the front entrance.

In relation to the coach house a lower ground floor will be created, old openings re-instated and more recent ones bricked up. Four roof lights will be added.

A total of 36 car parking spaces would be provided for the development. This would include an underground car park that will be positioned between the two buildings as well as surface parking across the site. Access to the underground area would be adjacent to Delamer Lodge. Two of the parking spaces will be accessed from the existing access to Higher Downs and the remainder from Cavendish Road. A bicycle store and bin store will be provided to the western end of the site with a further bicycle store at the eastern side of the site serving Delamer Lodge.

The gross internal floor space proposed is 2502.9 m² and the increase in floor space of the proposed development would be 320 m².

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**, adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.

- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 1st April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2013 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L1- Land for New homes
 L2- Meeting housing needs
 L4 – Sustainable transport and accessibility
 L7- Design
 L8- Planning Obligations
 R1- Historic Environment
 R2- Natural Environment

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

The Downs Conservation Area

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

ENV21 – Conservation Areas

OTHER RELEVANT DOCUMENTS

The Downs Conservation Area SPD5.5

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

H/30349 Erection of single storey rear extension (North Side) to form service route to dining room. Approved 13/12/89

H/24918 Alterations to external appearance of buildings (Amendments to scheme previously approved under H/23885. Approved 12/8/87

H/23885 Alterations and Extensions to Delamer Lodge involving construction of a basement link with Southbank, 3 storey rear extension to provide new staircase and new roof over. Approved 11/9/80.

H/22466 Change of use from flats to nursing home (as extension to South bank nursing home) and alterations to parking layout. Approved 16/1/86

H/01250 Conversion of existing residential hostel to a residential nursing home with car parking spaces for 10 vehicles. Approved 6/12/75

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

Carbon Budget statement, Design and Access Statement, Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, Access Statement, Heritage Statement, Crime Impact Statement and Arboricultural Report.

CONSULTATIONS

LHA – In response to revised parking arrangement- No objection to revised car parking arrangements. The only outstanding issue is that the cycle parking stands still lack shelter and security.

Environment Agency- No constraints found.

REPRESENTATIONS

Bowdon Downs Residents Association

- Generally pleased that the three fine Victorian assets are to be retained, restored and converted back into residential use. Welcomed the pre application discussions held with residents which addressed some of their concerns. Like the idea of a new town house on Higher Downs replacing the modern and inappropriate side extension at South Bank.
- Coach house welcome the original pitching eye window being reinstated, New windows are too large and will cause overlooking towards South Downs and the garden of 12 Higher Downs. Six skylights is excessive.
- Concerns regarding appearance and privacy/noise issues of the proposed balconies.
- Too many units being crammed in resulting in the need for too many parking spaces. A large part of the garden of Delamer Lodge has been sold to South Downs in recent years, reducing the plot size from when it was originally approved as a nursing home.
- Not acceptable to have parking spaces on raised ground just the other side of the brick garden wall at 14 and 15 Higher Downs.
- The increase in entrances and is not acceptable as the top end of Higher Downs is already hazardous traffic wise due to the proximity of the Grammar School.
- Loss of trees. Concerned about protection of remaining trees on and immediately adjacent to the site.
- Concerned that the original and early 1851 garden walls with no proper foundations will be destabilised due to excavation. Conditions should be put in place to ensure they are re-built should they collapse.
- More windows should be obscure glazed and roof lights should be non opening.
- The units should be more user friendly for people unable to use stairs.

- A 20mph zone should be introduced in this area.
- Estate agents boards should be banned as they are likely to become a permanent feature.

Comments on amended plans:-

- Support the principal of two cars per unit.
- Support the provision of enough green landscaping/garden on the combined sites
- Oppose the use of the cardok system but support the use of an underground car park as long as the entrance is reasonably screened from the road and pavement by plenty of planting.
- Would like the parking spaces close to the wall with No.15 Higher Downs re-located.
- The brick wall should be kept at or increased to a minimum of 2m with space for some additional planting to ensure privacy and lessen noise to Nos 14 and 15 Higher Downs.
- Don't see the need for the driveway at Higher Downs to be widened and resulting loss of boundary wall and screening.
- Object to the splitting of floors in Delamer Lodge. Will look unsightly if it extends right up to the windows. At the very least the floor should be set back as Option 2.
- As much high boundary screening as possible on Cavendish Road should be retained.
- Poor design of chimneys and chimney pots on the Coach House.
- Height of rear extension should be no higher than the existing height of brick garden walls to 13 and 14 Higher Downs.
- Windows should be painted white not grey.
- Request conditions be applied regarding no "For sale" or "to let signs" and tree survey to be undertaken and full protection given during building works including to trees immediately outside the site boundary.

Pleased with the following:

- no new entrances to the site
- dormers and balconies more respectful of the original buildings (although we still object to the principal of adding balconies when they overlook existing residents - as these do)
- obscured windows protecting privacy of residents
- green roof to look down upon at rear of Delamer Lodge
- revealing of stone work
- use of solid wood frames and glass windows in traditional design
- improvement of entrance area to South Bank
- use of red brick for 16 Higher Downs extension (although we think there is still an expanse of too much uncharacteristic glass and would like to see that reduced somewhat)

- scoring of the joints in the render at South Bank (an essential but important detail, often overlooked)
- reduction of skylights at The Coach House from 6 to 4 - although it will still cause light pollution at night, when before there was none at all - so even less would be preferred.

Further comments on amended plans:

- Welcome retention of the T2 tree, retention of chimney stack and pots on the coach house and the setting back of the floor plate at Delamer Lodge. Immediate residents now content with the overall proposals and welcomes the sympathetic restoration of the nursing home buildings and reasonable amount of green space retained. Appreciates the efforts made to address concerns by developer, agents, architects and Planning Officers.

. Bowdon Conservation Group

- The tree report shows that only 6 or 7 trees are retained out of a total of 20 individual trees and groups. One of the best is scheduled to be removed without reason. The proposal greatly reduces the space for any new planting along the site boundary on Cavendish Road, effectively preventing any use of large tree species in the long term to actually reflect the character of the area. Permission should be refused for the removal of this tree and other trees without a substantive landscape specification that proves the replacement planting will be successful and in keeping.

Following the submission of revised plans:

The Bowdon Conservation Group have advised that there are no amendments to the proposed loss of trees in the street scene and there is car parking/vehicle manoeuvring right up to the base of trees shown to be retained along the frontage. Proposal does not enhance or conserve the setting of the Conservation Area and is not in accordance with the Core Strategy.

Altrincham and Bowdon Civic Society

- The development is too intensive and insufficient space on site to provide for residents. Should be a reduction in the number of units proposed and the introduction of a 20mph speed limit,

Cheshire Wildlife Trust- Support the recommendations for mitigation and compensation.

Neighbours -10 representations have been received from local residents raising the following points –

- Welcome conversion back to residential use
- Welcome the removal of the ugly later extensions and restoration of some features.

- 17 dwellings with 53 bedrooms is far too intensive.
- Unsympathetic existing extensions should be removed and buildings returned to their original style.
- The building of a new town house on Higher Downs in place of the high side, unsightly extension and driveway is an elegant solution. However too much glass especially as it will be seen from the street with the driveway in front.
- Ground level between Southbank and Delamer Lodge is proposed to be raised. Enhanced green screening should be provided.
- Too much tree coverage, green areas, shrubs and hedges will be lost which will be detrimental to the Conservation Area. More planting should be undertaken.
- Impact of excavation on mature trees in neighbours garden. Tree protection scheme should be submitted to address how they will be protected.
- Impact of excavation on boundary walls and the Coach house which are likely to be without foundations.
- Should be condition to ensure “For Sale” and “To let” signs not allowed
- Overlooking from balcony over entrance to South Bank and also will appear over bearing and dominant.
- Balcony on Delamer Lodge will be very noticeable. If it has to be then the mature trees screening it should be retained.
- Addition of windows in the rear of South Bank and the side of Delamer Lodge resulting in loss of privacy
- Concerned about the extent to which ground levels are to be raised. Not clear on plans how much and the implications for privacy
- Sunken patio of the Coach House preferable to one at ground level due to difference in ground level and resulting loss of privacy.
- Welcome the original pitching eye of coach house being reinstated, middle window is too big. Disproportionate affecting character of the building and will allow too much overlooking. Original planning approval required these windows to be obscure glazed, which they never were. Lower ground floor window should be single width to reduce the possibility of noise and disturbance.
- Unclear how many roof lights in coach house but 6 is excessive and unnecessary. Should be non opening to maintain privacy and keep noise down.
- 33 Car parking spaces will mean many movements and road safety issues.
- Should be 2 parking spaces per dwelling.
- Lack of Visitor parking
- Spaces should not be allocated to a specific unit then if one apartment has visitors or work people in addition to their own two cars they will not be forced to drive around looking for a place to park.
- New car exit from Delamer Lodge is closer to the bend and even more dangerous.
- 20mph zone and/or traffic restrictions
- Traffic Survey took place on 19th May when many girl’s at Altrincham Grammar School were on study leave.
- Application should be viewed in conjunction with the recently approved scheme at Trinity Church. The creation of a total of 29 new dwellings in close proximity.

- Should give more consideration to the need for more sheltered housing schemes. The residents would be more elderly and likely to have fewer cars.
- Problems of refuse collection
- Use of Welsh slate for the new build is welcome however grey window frames although fashionable at the moment will soon look dated. Wooden sash windows should be white to fit in with the character of the Victorian houses.

Amended plans

A further representation has been received expressing:

- Concern about the rear elevation of Delamer Lodge and privacy of buildings in Higher Downs.
- Inconsistency in submitted drawings.

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE

1. The re-use of redundant buildings is to be welcomed and the principle of a residential use for this building in this primarily residential area is considered acceptable. The development of this brownfield site would contribute towards meeting the Councils housing targets. The buildings are currently vacant and the longer they remain vacant the more susceptible they will become to vandalism and break-ins. The apartments all have either 3 or 4 bedrooms and can therefore be considered suitable for families.

IMPACT ON CONSERVATION AREA

2. The buildings on the site were erected in the Mid 19th Century. There have been a number of unsympathetic extensions and alterations to the buildings including dormers and a 3 storey extension and staircase to the rear of Southbank, a 3 storey rear extension to Delamer Lodge and a single storey link between the two buildings. In respect of the Coach house original openings have been bricked up and new ones created. Throughout the development original timber sliding sash window have been replaced with modern casement windows. Much of the site has been hard surfaced in order to provide parking.
3. The single storey link between the two buildings will be removed. This is welcomed and will restore their character as individual buildings.
4. It is proposed that the 3 storey extension at the rear of Southbank will be removed together with a 2 storey bay window on the original rear elevation, a single storey modern extension and external staircases and replaced with a modern design, new extension which will be smaller in height, scale and massing than the existing. The existing unsympathetic dormers will be replaced with more traditional dormers with slate cladding to fit in with the existing roof. The windows will be replaced with timber framed sash windows.

5. The previous unsympathetic works undertaken to Delamer Lodge relate to the 3 storey extension to the rear of the building and access arrangements to the front. The 3 storey extension will be retained but refaced with a brick to match that used in neighbouring buildings and in the construction of the new South Bank extension. Part of the single storey extension to the rear of Delamer Lodge is to be replaced with a contemporary design with a green roof, while part is to be removed. As with Southbank the modern access arrangements to the building's main entrance on the front elevation are to be removed, and together with reinstatement of original ground levels will allow direct and level access into the building. The existing 3 storey extension at the rear of Delamer Lodge will be re-clad in a brick more sympathetic to the character of the building. Again existing windows are to be replaced with traditional timber framed sashes and other additions including the dark brick cladding at basement level and concrete wall removed.
6. The proposal as originally submitted included the addition of dormers. These have subsequently been replaced with recessed balconies being cut into the roof space and set within the plane of the existing roof. This will minimise the impact on Delamer Lodge and the visual impact from the street scene.
7. An additional floor is to be introduced into Delamer Lodge. Amended plans have been received showing new floor is set away from the front windows to Delamer Lodge. This would help mitigate the impact of the new floor on the external appearance of the building and hence its contribution to the conservation area.
8. The heritage significance of the Coach House has been eroded through the blocking up of original openings and the insertion of new; the attachment of the poorly designed single storey extension which links the building with Delamer Lodge and the painting of the brick work white. The proposed scheme will re-open some of the original openings including the arched entrance at ground floor window and the oriel window at first floor. Some later insertions will be blocked up and 4 conservation style roof lights added. The existing chimneys and chimney pots will be retained. The extension linking it to Delamer lodge will be replaced with a more contemporary one. It is also intended to remove the white paint and replace the windows with traditional timber framed sashes.
9. Other external works are proposed, including surface car parking, underground parking including the access to it, bike and bin storage areas. Surface level parking will occupy much the same area as currently occupied by hard surfacing, though some landscaping to the Cavendish Road boundary in particular would be reduced. The underground element of parking would be situated between the two main buildings and below part of the surface parking area; access to it would be via a ramp situated immediately adjacent to the side of Delamer Lodge. Whilst there would be a visual impact of this access ramp (the materials to line the retaining side walls of the ramp have yet to be agreed), its position so close to

the building and the retention of landscaping together with the overall benefits of the scheme) are such that it would not cause unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the conservation area.

10. The main area for bikes and bins is proposed to be between the side elevation of Southbank and the boundary with Higher Downs. Concern has been expressed that this would necessitate the removal of a Cut-leaf Beech tree along the boundary with Higher Downs. The loss of this tree would be harmful to the character of the area and an amended layout for this bike and bin storage area has been provided. This will ensure the retention of the tree with no other adverse impacts on the scheme. The amended layout also has the benefit of allowing for more planting (new and retained) to the boundary with Higher Downs which will mitigate any adverse effects of these functional requirements on the conservation area. A second, smaller bike store is proposed adjacent to the eastern boundary and in this location would have little impact on the character of the area.
11. The development will utilise the two existing accesses one from Higher Downs and one from Cavendish Road. The entrance from Higher Downs will be widened to increase the visibility splay and improve highway safety. This will result in the loss of a section of boundary wall. Low stone walls and planting are typical features of the Downs Conservation Area. The access from Higher Downs does not currently have stone piers which are found throughout the Conservation Area. It is suggested that a condition be applied requiring stone piers be provided to compensate for the detrimental loss of a section of the wall.
12. The proposal indicates that black metal sliding gates will be installed across the Cavendish Road entrance. It is considered that such gates are unlikely to be acceptable. This matter can be dealt with by condition.
13. Overall it is considered that the proposed works to the three buildings will improve their appearance and will better reflect the character of the original buildings and the character of the Downs Conservation Area. Other external works would have some impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area which would be less than significant and which it is considered would be outweighed by the public benefits of bringing the site back into residential use.

ACCESS AND PARKING

14. To meet the Council's car parking standards 36 car parking spaces should be provided in total. The proposal as amended meets the Council's standards. 2 spaces will be accessed from Higher Downs and the remaining spaces including the underground car park from Cavendish Road. The provision of an underground car park with 12 car parking spaces ensures the development will meet the Council's standards and helps retain the amount of soft landscaping

which will enhance the appearance of the development in the interest of the Conservation Area.

15. The development requires 19 communal cycle parking spaces or 38 allocated spaces. Two cycle storage areas will be provided. Further details in respect of the shelter and security are required but this can be dealt with by condition. The impact of these on the conservation area are assessed in the section above.
16. It is proposed to replace the existing tarmac surface with a porous resin bonded gravel that will be more appropriate for the Conservation Area location.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

17. The main areas of concern in relation to the potential impact on the amenity of adjoining properties are from the proposed extensions in particular the three storey rear extension to Southbank. Windows serving habitable rooms are currently located facing No.15 Higher Downs. These will be replaced with windows facing either east or west. This will improve the privacy enjoyed by No.15. The proposed extension will have a pitched roof and be lower than the existing extension. It is therefore considered that the impact in respect of massing and light will be less than for the existing extension.
18. The existing dormers on Southbank are located in the front elevation. There will be additional dormers in the side elevations facing east and west. They will not be directly overlooking any other residential property. The new recessed balconies on Delamer Lodge will be on the front elevation facing Cavendish Road and will also not be directly overlooking adjoining properties.
19. Concern has been expressed from residents about the height of the single storey extension at the rear of Delamer Lodge. The applicant has indicated it will not extend beyond the height of the boundary wall with Nos 13 and 14 Higher Downs and it will not therefore have an undue impact on those properties. A condition could be added to ensure that is the case.
20. Residents have indicated that existing walls bounding the site may not have foundations and could be damaged by the proposed works. It is the applicant's intention to retain this wall. A condition can be imposed to require details to ensure the protection of the wall and making good if damage to the wall occurs.

TREES

21. The most valuable trees on the site are located within the triangle of land where Cavendish Road and Higher Downs meet. This area will largely be retained. A condition regarding tree protection should be applied to an approval to ensure these and others along the boundary of the site are protected during building works. Amendments to the bike and bin storage area in this part of the site are

discussed above and these will ensure the retention of the important Cut-leaf Beech tree on this boundary.

22. A number of trees are proposed for removal including a Sycamore that is in poor health and a flowering Cherry adjacent to the Coach House. The loss of these and other trees and shrubs is not of such concern that the scheme should be refused and additional tree planting will be required by condition; it is considered there is space on site, particularly along the boundary with Cavendish Road to do this. Overall the effect of the development, and in particular the extent of car parking, would be a slight reduction in extent of landscaping but the overall benefits of the scheme are considered to outweigh any harm from this. It is also considered that a well considered landscaping scheme would improve the quality of the landscaping on the site.
23. The Council's requirements for Specific Green Infrastructure are that one tree is planted per apartment, a total of 17 trees. Green roofs/walls/hedges can also contribute to this if they are new and in addition to existing/beyond replacements for those removed. This is in addition to any trees lost. This can be addressed by imposing a landscaping condition.
24. A point arising from the Arboricultural Report is that the consultant strongly advocates the retention of a consultant arboriculturist for the duration of the project. The applicant has advised that it is their intention to do this and this would help ensure that conditions applied to an approval would be implemented and trees on and immediately adjacent to the site are adequately protected.

CONCLUSION

25. The re-use of these vacant buildings for residential purposes is welcomed. It is considered that the proposal will result in the removal of certain modern extensions and alterations which have a negative impact on these buildings and the Downs Conservation Area. Overall it is considered that the proposed changes are in line with the character of Sub-Area D of the Conservation Area as set out in The Downs Conservation Area Appraisal SPD5.5 and will protect, preserve and enhance the Downs Conservation Area, a designated Heritage asset in accordance with Policy R1 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the NPPF. Overall it is considered that the scheme would not harm the conservation area and that the increase in housing stock on brownfield site would also be of public benefit.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

26. This proposal is subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and is located in the 'hot zone' for residential development, consequently private market houses will be liable to a CIL charge rate of £80 per square metre, and

apartments will be liable to a CIL charge rate of £65 per square metre, in line with Trafford's CIL charging schedule and revised SPD1: Planning Obligations (2014).

27. A planning obligation under the policies of the Core Strategy and SPD1 would be required to provide affordable housing. The applicant has, however, submitted a viability assessment which has concluded that the scheme cannot support any form of affordable housing contribution without it becoming unviable. Council officers have assessed this and accept its conclusions. It is considered that the development is relatively small in scale and is likely to be undertaken in one phase, in addition the proposal would be unlikely to generate sufficient return such that an overage clause should be required by planning agreement


RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions

1. Standard 3 years
2. Amended plans
3. Approval of materials
4. Landscaping scheme to be submitted including 1 tree per apartment or other measures to be agreed.
5. Landscaping maintenance
6. Tree protection
7. Retention of consultant arboriculturist to monitor development
8. Details of stone piers to be submitted and provided to both Higher Downs entrance and Cavendish Road. Implement recommendations of Crime impact assessment
9. No estate agent boards
10. Single storey rear extension to Delamer lodge shall not exceed the height of the boundary wall.
11. Bat mitigation measures
12. Privacy screens
13. Scheme for retention of walls and piers/rebuild of wall if necessary
14. Suds scheme

CR



Southbank & Delamer Lodge, 1-2 Cavendish Road, Altrincham (site hatched on plan)



Scale: 1:1,250

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright 2012.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Organisation	Trafford Council
Department	Planning Service
Comments	Committee date 9/07/2015
Date	29/06/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

WARD: Priory

84566/FUL/14

DEPARTURE: No

Retrospective planning permission to retain 2.4m high paladin mesh fencing along the south and east boundaries.

Priory Nursery, 159 Dane Road, Sale, M33 2NG

APPLICANT: Brookhouse Group

AGENT:

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

SITE

The application site comprises a stabling and riding facility known as Priory Nursery which is set within Green Belt land on the northern edge of the Sale urban area. It is enclosed on three sides by mature tree belts and landscaping and covers an area of 3.81 hectares. To the west the site is bound by Priory Gardens woodland and public thoroughfare which also extends around the northern end of the site to form a green buffer between the site and the M60 motorway which runs east-west 50m away. Cow Lane, which links Dane Road with the motorway footbridge, runs adjacent to the eastern site boundary and separates Priory Nursery from the rear gardens of houses on Arnesby Avenue, a residential cul-de-sac.

A 4m high wall runs along the southern edge of the site for a length of 36m and forms the common boundary with the neighbouring Conservative Club with its associated Bowling Green and Car Park. Two access roads into the site from Dane Road run adjacent to the eastern and western boundaries of the Conservative Club. A block of retirement flats which fronts onto Dane Road backs onto the south-eastern corner of the site.

The Priory Nursery site largely comprises two open fields, upon which sits a 40m x 20m outdoor ménage, and a number of paddocks enclosed by 1.8m-2m high picket fencing. A modest-sized dwellinghouse dating from the late 1970s sits against the southern boundary wall of the site, whilst three rows of stables running parallel to each other have been built nearby to the south-western corner of Priory Nursery.

PROPOSAL

Retrospective planning permission is sought to retain 2.4 metre high green paladin mesh fencing along the south and east boundary of Priory Nursery.

A landscaping plan has been submitted proposing to plant a 'double row' hedge beneath the existing tree canopy and to sow two different wildflower seed mixes

beneath the trees, the proposed hedge would be planted against the perimeter fence on the westerly side. The proposed hedge would be of native species, namely – Hazel, Hawthorn, Holly, Dog Rose and Guelder Rose.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**, adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 1st April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2013 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L7 – Design

R2 – Natural Environment

R3 – Green Infrastructure

R4 – Green Belt, Countryside and other Protected Open Land

R5- Open Space, Sport and Recreation

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

- Green Belt
- Wildlife Corridor
- Areas of Nature Conservation Value, Tree and Hedgerow Protection, Special Landscape Features
- New Open Space/Outdoor Recreation Proposals
- Protection of Landscape Character

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

81049/COND/2013 - Application for approval of details reserved by conditions of grant of planning permission 77029/FULL/2011. Condition numbers 4, 5, 6 and 7. Part discharged: 12.05.2015

81048/COND/2013 - Application for approval of details reserved by conditions of grant of planning permission 80585/FULL/2013. Condition numbers 3 and 4. Approved: 31.10.2013

80585/FULL/2013 - Demolition of existing 3-bedroom property and erection of replacement 5-bedroom two-storey dwellinghouse with garage and associated landscaping works. Approved with conditions: 02.07.2013

80273/TW/2013 - Works to protected trees: the pruning of one Lime tree and three Sycamore Maple trees. Tree App Consent to Cut Down: 19.06.2013

79220/FULL/2012 - Erection of temporary stable block. Approved with conditions: 19.12.2012

79032/FULL/2012 - Erection of 2.4 metre high paladin fencing around site boundary. Approved with conditions: 03.10.2012.

78945/FULL/2012 - Refurbishment of, and extensions to, existing brick-built stables; erection of replacement timber stable block following demolition of existing, smaller structure; and formation of roof over courtyard to create enclosed stable and storage area. Relocation of existing outdoor menage. Approved with conditions: 16.10.2012

77029/FULL/2011 - Erection of a detached building to form private indoor riding arena, stud farm facilities and associated offices and storage. Works ancillary thereto including hardstanding, car parking, paddocks and soft landscaping. Approved with conditions: 14.02.2013

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

None.

CONSULTATIONS

Highways Asset Engineer – Cow Lane is a Public Right of Way, it has restricted byway status. Requests that should climbers be planted on the fence, a condition to any

consent is made that the applicant is responsible for preventing such climbers from rooting along the earth margins of Cow Lane and subsequently spreading.

REPRESENTATIONS

1 letter was received from a resident of Arnesby Avenue, summarised as follows:

- Would like to comment on the application, as a regular user of Cow Lane.
- The application is an example of the company pushing the boundaries of the planning permission
- The fence borders the National Cycle trail and forces a confined space for bikes and walkers, the path should be further back giving a wider trail for users, as the land is of no use to the company
- The previous planning permission included landscaping to the bank, but the applicants have only planted a laurel hedge to the top of the bank, blocking sunlight to the pathway. Asks the Council to insist the company remove the laurels. (*The laurels do not need planning permission and therefore the Council cannot require that these are removed*).

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

1. The principle of erecting a 2.4m high paladin fence to enclose the application site was established following grant of planning permission 79032/FULL/2012. The current application relates to the re-positioning of the fence, along the eastern boundary of the site, immediately adjacent to Cow Lane, rather than set back behind the existing trees at the top of the bank.
2. The applicant's justification for re-siting the fence is to improve the security of the site, and to defend the boundary line, following several instances of anti-social behaviour between the previously approved fence line, and the footpath. The impact of the re-located fence line is discussed below.

OPENNESS OF GREEN BELT

3. It is acknowledged that boundary fencing does not occupy a footprint as such, and as a result the openness of the Green Belt land is not considered to be significantly affected as a result of the current application.
4. The proposed fencing runs along the boundary of the site, and the edge of the Green Belt land. Given that a similar application was approved for fencing in a different position, the primary consideration is whether the current application would have an increased impact on the visual amenities of the Green Belt, and the area generally; assessed below.

VISUAL AMENITY

5. The fencing has been relocated from approx. 10m within the site boundary, to the very eastern edge of the site, along the public footpath Cow Lane. It is recognised that paladin fencing has a 'mesh' design which allows views through it, which in this instance consists of the pleasant character of the Green Belt beyond, and that its green colour will allow it to be absorbed into any background landscaping more readily.
6. The fencing runs directly along Cow Lane, and therefore more immediately encloses the footpath than previously approved. Unlike the previously approved scheme, there is no scope for planting to the exterior of the site to soften the visual appearance of the fence, and therefore any proposed planting to this affect would be located behind the fence. To address the impact of the fence on the visual amenity of the area, a proposed landscaping scheme has been submitted as part of the application.
7. The proposed landscaping, consists of a 'double row' hedge beneath the existing tree canopy and proposes to sow two different wildflower seed mixes beneath the trees, the proposed hedge would be planted against the perimeter fence on the westerly side. The proposed hedge would be of native species, namely – Hazel, Hawthorn, Holly, Dog Rose and Guelder Rose. The plants would be supplied as 2 -+ 1 transplants, and as such would have spent two years from propagation in a nursery row, before another year in a nursery.
8. The landscape proposal is considered to be satisfactory, and if properly implemented, would achieve the management objective of softening the visual impact of the perimeter fence. It is therefore considered that the impact of the fence on the visual amenity of the area would not be so great as to justify a reason for refusal of the scheme, subject to the implementation of the landscaping proposal. It is therefore recommended that planning permission is granted, and a condition is imposed to ensure the delivery of the proposed landscaping scheme.

IMPACT ON PUBLIC FOOTPATH

9. The Local Highways Authority has not raised any objections in terms of the impact of the fence on the public footpath and it is considered that the fencing does not encroach onto the footpath or unduly restrict the width of the footpath. It is also considered that, given the open mesh design of the fence, it will not result in a level of enclosure that would restrict natural surveillance and would therefore not result in any significant impact in terms of community safety. Greater Manchester Police Design for Security have been consulted and any comments will be reported in the Additional Information Report.


RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions

1. Details – retrospective planning permission in accordance with submitted plans
2. Landscaping.

OSt-A



Priory Nursery, 159 Dane Road, Sale (site hatched on plan)



Scale: 1:2,500

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright 2012.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Organisation	Trafford Council
Department	Planning Service
Comments	Committee date 9/07/2015
Date	29/06/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

WARD: Davyhulme West

84644/HHA/15

DEPARTURE: No

Erection of a single storey side and rear extension.

63 Woodhouse Road, Davyhulme, M41 7NT

APPLICANT: Mrs Paula Kerry

AGENT: Mr Mike Tierney

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

The applicant is a Council employee.

SITE

This application relates to a semi-detached dwelling house in a residential area. The plot comprises of a large area of hard standing to the front of the property and a single storey front/side extension which runs along the gable elevation. The rear of the property comprises of a single storey extension and a back garden. Boundaries are marked by wood panel fencing. The plot is surrounded by residential properties on all sides.

PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes to partially demolish the side extension and build a larger side element in its place, which would also project to the rear of the property. This would have a part mono-pitch/part dual-pitch/hipped roof and would accommodate an enlarged office, together with a utility room and study. The extension would introduce a side facing utility room window and a set of rear facing study room glazed double doors.

The applicant originally proposed a 2 storey side and rear extension which has been subsequently amended to a single storey side and rear extension.

The proposed development would increase the property's internal floor space by 10.9 square metres.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25 January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan** (UDP), adopted 19 June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.

- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 1 April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26 April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L7 – Design.

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

None.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

None.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

H/69401: Erection of single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation. Approved 18 June 2008.

H/66712: Erection of single storey front extension to property to enlarge garage and create porch extension and addition of new roof to existing garage. Approved 21 May 2007.

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

None.

CONSULTATIONS

None.

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbours - A letter of objection has been received from the adjacent occupant which was in response to the original scheme, namely a 2 storey side and rear extension. The concerns raised are as follows;

- The development is not in context with surrounding properties.
- The development would result in a large side wall which would have an over-dominant effect.

- The development would unacceptably undermine the amount of sunlight received by their property.
- Construction works will cause considerable disruption.
- The extension would be close to the common boundary fence which the neighbouring occupant would not consent to being removed.

OBSERVATIONS

DESIGN AND APPEARANCE

1. In relation to matters of design, Policy L7 of the Core Strategy states development must be appropriate in its context, make best use of opportunities to improve the character and quality of an area, and enhance the street scene or character of the area by appropriately addressing scale, density, height, massing, layout, elevation treatment, materials, hard and soft landscaping works and boundary treatment.
2. The development would be visible within the street scene. Its design would be acceptable with reference to the existing property, and it will not look out of place or have a negative impact on the character of the area. The extension would be subordinate to the original property and would not represent an overdevelopment of the plot. The proposed external materials would be acceptable.
3. Whilst it is accepted that the side extension would not maintain a 0.75m gap between its side wall and the common boundary, this is nevertheless acceptable because the current side extension only has a 0.68m gap to its side, and several properties on Woodhouse Road have side extensions built up to the side boundary.
4. The proposed development would not have an unacceptable design and appearance impact.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

5. In relation to matters of amenity protection Policy L7 of the Core Strategy states development must be compatible with the surrounding area; and not prejudice the amenity of the future occupiers of the development and/or occupants of adjacent properties by reason of overbearing, overshadowing, overlooking, visual intrusion, noise and/or disturbance, odour or in any other way.
6. The proposed single storey extension would project 3.31m and would be set in by 0.3m from the common boundary with the adjacent property, thereby essentially complying with SPD4 paragraph 3.4.2.
7. The development would introduce a set of rear facing habitable room glazed doors with the separation distance to the rear boundary exceeding the 10.5m minimum (10.7m). This door would face a neighbouring habitable room window however the separation distance would exceed the 21m minimum (25m).
8. The proposed side facing utility room window would face the side wall of the adjacent property's garage.

9. The proposed development would not result in an unacceptable overbearing, overshadowing or privacy impact upon neighbouring properties.

FLOODING

10. The application site is in a Flood Risk Zone 2 area. The applicant has submitted a completed FRA form confirming the new floor levels will be set no lower than those of the current property.

CONCLUSION

11. It is considered that the proposed development would not result in unacceptable design and appearance, residential amenity or flood impacts. It is therefore recommended that planning permission should be granted subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time
2. List of approved plans
3. Matching materials


Informative:

1. Positive and proactive – amended plans
2. Landfill 250m

TP



63 Woodhouse Road, Davyhulme (site hatched on plan)



Scale: 1:1,250

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright 2012.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Organisation	Trafford Council
Department	Planning Service
Comments	Committee date 9/07/2015
Date	29/06/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

WARD: Stretford

84968/FUL/15

DEPARTURE: No

Conversion of former Health Centre into a House of Multiple Occupation (10 bed) and 2no. retail units (Use Class A1) fronting Kingsway, with associated parking, bin storage and communal courtyard and external alterations to window arrangements.

Mitford Lodge, 90 Mitford Street, Stretford, M32 8AQ

APPLICANT: Acamba Systems

AGENT: Nick Howard Planning

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

SITE

The application relates to a single storey building, which was formally occupied as a health centre with ten consultant rooms and a dental suite. The building fronts Mitford Street and Kingsway is situated to the south of the site. Residential properties on Mitford Street are situated opposite the site, to the north. Offices to a home care agency and a large electricity substation are situated to the west of the site and an open public garden is situated to the east. Stretford Mall and a pedestrian subway underneath Kingsway are situated to the south of the site. Public footpaths are situated immediately adjacent to the building to the east and west of the site.

The building has been unlawfully converted into an 11 bed house of multiple occupation (HMO) and two commercial units. One of these units is operating as a barbers shop and the other as a hot food takeaway.

PROPOSAL

The application proposes the change of use from a health centre to a House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) with 10 bedrooms (Use Class C4) and two small retail units (Use Class A1). One of the retail units would have a floor area of 52m² and another would have a floor area of 46m². The HMO would also include communal facilities comprising of two kitchens, a lounge and a dining room. The bedrooms would range in size from 13.9m² to 28.1m², each of which would include en-suite facilities. An existing internal courtyard within the building would serve the proposed HMO, providing a seating and grassed area, cycle parking and bin storage.

The application also proposes the replacement of existing windows and doors and changes to the window designs to including the installation of obscure glazing and steel railings to the lower levels of the windows on the east and west side elevations.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan** (UDP), adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 1st April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2013 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L1 – Land for New Homes

L2 – Meeting Housing

L4 – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

L7 – Design

W2 – Town Centres and Retail

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

Unallocated

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

None

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

84979/FUL/15 - Conversion of former Health Centre into a House of Multiple Occupation (6 bed), 2no. offices (Use Class B1) fronting Mitford Street and 2no. retail (Use Class A1) units fronting Kingsway, with ancillary parking, bin storage and communal courtyard and external alterations to window arrangements - This application

is recommended for approval and is also being considered by the Planning Committee under the same agenda.

82214/FULL/2014 - Conversion of former health centre into a house in multiple occupation (11-bed) with 2no. retail units (Use Class A1) fronting Kingsway. External alterations to alter window arrangement – This application was withdrawn by the applicant after it was recommended to be refused.

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has submitted a Planning Statement, a Design and Access Statement, a Management Plan, a Servicing Plan and details of a public consultation that they have carried out to accompany the application. The information provided within these statements is referred to where relevant within this report.

CONSULTATIONS

Economic Growth – Raise concerns in relation to the proposed residential accommodation. The Stretford Town Centre Masterplan identifies the site for new residential development and the principle of bringing this site back into use is supported. They note that the Greater Manchester SHMA recognised that alongside a sustained emphasis on the development of family housing it is important that the town centres across the Borough continue to attract high quality residential uses. This will continue to ensure the on-going renaissance of the town centres and ensure that they continue to develop as vibrant centres of activity. They do not consider that the proposed development meets this objective as it does not provide for high quality residential uses or housing suitable for families. Furthermore the conversion of this single storey building does not provide optimum use of the site or the density of development appropriate within the urban area / a town centre location adjoining high density residential development. No objections are raised in regards to the proposed retail units.

LHA – No objections, full comments are discussed in the Observations section of this report.

Pollution & Licensing – No objections, recommend that the hours of use of the retail and office units are restricted to day time hours.

Greater Manchester Police Design for Security – No objections. They have met with the developer and talked through their original objections (to the previous planning application 82214/FULL/2014). All of the measures suggested by Design for Security have been incorporated into the scheme. A condition is recommended requiring that the security measures proposed are implemented in accordance with the approved plan within 3 months of the application being approved.

Electricity North West – No objections, standing advice relating to development on land adjacent to their infrastructure is provided.

REPRESENTATIONS

One letter of objection has been received from a neighbouring resident of Mitford Street, which raises the following concerns: -

- The type of tenants targeted by HMOs are often those most vulnerable within society. Consider that the applicant is not dedicated to the site, having previously put the site up for auction prior to the application.
- Poor level of amenity for the tenants. Overflowing bins demonstrates a contempt to provide for their needs and the environment of its neighbours
- It has dramatically impacted on the feel of Mitford Street for the worse.
- Incidents witnessed include residents parking without permits, misuse of the disabled bay in front of the building, fights and rows held in the street by residents or their visitors, use of illegal drugs openly on a residential street.
- The fact the developers have submitted two applications demonstrates that it is only a money making exercise.

Councillor Adshead and Councillor Ross have requested that their previous comments and objections to the last application (82214/FULL/2014) are taken into account in this application as they do not see a change from the previous proposal. Their concerns are: -

- The site is included in the Stretford Masterplan area; as this is a key location, concerned that the proposal is dominated by an 11 bedroom HMO and feel that this does not tie in with the long term aims of the masterplan.
- The impact of the proposal on local parking.
- Consider that whilst proposals for business units are welcome, consideration needs to be given in regards to what type of businesses are proposed and how they fit strategically within the masterplan.

OBSERVATIONS

BACKGROUND

1. This application has been submitted following the withdrawal of a previous application ref: 82214/FULL/2014, which proposed the conversion of the former health centre into a house in multiple occupation (11-bed) with 2no. retail units (Use Class A1) fronting Kingsway, with external alterations to alter window arrangements. This application was presented to the Planning Committee in July 2014, with a recommendation of refusal for the following reasons: -
 - The proposed development would result in an unacceptable level of residential amenity for future occupiers of the proposed HMO as a result of a combination of the size of living accommodation, lack of outdoor amenity space, obscure glazing to bedroom windows, restricted outlook and proximity of bedroom windows to public footway resulting in a lack of privacy, noise and disturbance. The

proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies L2 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's Planning Guidelines: New Residential Development.

- The proposed development and occupants would be vulnerable to criminal damage and anti-social behaviour as a result of a poor level of natural surveillance due to the high level of obscure glazed windows, and lack of any defensible space due to the fact that there are public footpaths immediately adjacent on three sides of the building and due to the positioning of windows on these elevations. As such the proposed development fails to reduce opportunities for crime and would therefore have an adverse impact on public safety and the security interests of the future occupants of the proposed HMO and neighbouring residents. Therefore the development would be contrary to Policies L2 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's Planning Guidelines, New Residential Development.
 - No specific provision of refuse storage for the retail units and inadequate and poorly located provision of refuse storage for the residential units would result in visual harm, detracting from the street scene and character of the area and poor environmental standards which can lead to criminal and antisocial behaviour. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies L2 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's Planning Guidelines, New Residential Development.
 - The proposal fails to provide adequate off road car parking provision and cycle storage for the proposed development and thus would lead to on street car parking to the detriment of the residential amenity of the occupants of nearby houses. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies L2, L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Standards.
 - The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed retail units could be serviced in a way that would not lead to congestion on Mitford Street, to the detriment of the free-flow of traffic and highway safety and the residential amenity of occupants of nearby houses. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy.
2. The applicant chose to withdraw the application prior to the Planning Committee meeting.
 3. This planning application seeks a revised proposal, which the applicant considers addresses these previous recommended reasons for refusal. Officers also consider that the applicant has addressed these reasons for refusal and the reasons for this are discussed in the report below.

PRINCIPLE OF PROPOSAL

4. The application proposes the creation of residential accommodation and retail floor space. The application site is not specifically allocated in the Revised Adopted Trafford Unitary Development Plan (2006) although it is identified in the Consultation Draft Land Allocations Plan (January 2014) under Policy TC1 as being within the Stretford Town Centre boundary and under Policy STR1.2 – Land at Bennett Street Action Area as being suitable for residential development. While this plan is still at the very earliest stage of production and consultation, the identification of this site under the above policies should be regarded as a material consideration, albeit of limited weight.
5. The Stretford Town Centre Masterplan also identifies the application site for new residential development and the principle of bringing the site back into use is supported. The primary objective of the Masterplan is to secure the successful regeneration of Stretford Town Centre and relevant objectives are:
 - MO1: To bring forward sustainable development that realises the full potential of Stretford Town Centre and the surrounding area.
 - MO8: To provide residential development and a better balance in housing types.
6. It is noted that the Greater Manchester Strategic Housing Market Assessment recognises that alongside a sustained emphasis on the development of family housing it is important that the town centres across the Borough continue to attract high quality residential uses. This is to assist the on-going renaissance of the town centres and ensure that they continue to develop as vibrant centres of activity. It is recognised that the proposal does not provide high quality residential accommodation or housing suitable for families.
7. Policy L1 of the Core Strategy seeks to release sufficient land to accommodate 12,210 new dwellings (net of clearance) over the plan period up to 2026. Regular monitoring has revealed that despite maintaining a five year housing land supply in accordance with government guidance, the actual rate of building is failing to meet the housing land target as expressed in Table L1 of the Core Strategy. Therefore, there exists a significant need to not only meet the level of housing land supply identified within Policy L1 of the Core Strategy, but also to make up for a recent shortfall in housing completions. It is therefore considered that despite the proposal not providing high quality residential accommodation or family housing, the proposal would make a positive contribution to the Council's housing land supply and in addition the proposal will contribute to meeting targets for the development of brownfield land (Policy L1.7).
8. Policy L2.6 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that proposals contribute to meeting the housing needs of the Borough. Whilst the proposal is for a very large House in Multiple Occupation, it is considered that it will go some way to meeting a need in the Borough, albeit one that is not specifically identified in the Core

Strategy. The principle of residential development on the site is therefore considered acceptable.

9. In regards to the proposed retail development, the site is not located within any of the town, district, local or neighbourhood shopping centres. Policy W2.12 states that outside of these centres there will be a presumption against the development of retail, leisure and other town centre-type uses except where it can be demonstrated that they satisfy the tests outlined in current Government Guidance. The retail units proposed as part of the development are of a modest scale and are immediately adjacent to the existing Stretford Town Centre boundary (and proposed for inclusion within in the Consultation Draft Land Allocations Plan). As such, it is considered that the proposal will support the vitality and viability of Stretford Town Centre and is consistent with Core Strategy Policy W2.12. The proposed retail units would also not undermine the Masterplan objectives as they would complement the existing retail and service provision within the town centre. It is also considered that although there is vacant floorspace within Stretford Mall (the town centre core), the Masterplan recognises that the successful regeneration of the town centre will require an increase in active frontages along Kingsway which has the potential to make the area more attractive and contribute to the aspirations of reducing the severance caused by Kingsway. The proposed retail units are therefore also considered acceptable in principle.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

10. A minimum distance of 15.5m lies between the bedroom windows on the northern elevation of the building and the neighbouring residential properties on the northern side of Mitford Street. These separation distances are typical of those between terraced properties on Mitford Street and the surrounding area and there were windows in the former health centre on this elevation. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in an undue loss of privacy to neighbouring residents.
11. The proposed retail units are situated to the south of the building, facing Stretford Mall, away from neighbouring residential properties. The units would front a busy highway. It is therefore considered that these units would not result in undue noise and disturbance to existing neighbouring residential properties on Mitford Street. The applicant has not detailed proposed opening hours of these units, however it is considered that due to the size of the units and the close proximity of the site to Stretford Town Centre, it is also considered that the proposed commercial units would not unduly impact on the occupants of the proposed adjoining HMO. If Committee were minded to approve the application, then it is recommended that the opening hours of these retail units are restricted to prevent undue noise and disturbance to the residents of the HMO during night time hours.

12. Under the last planning application 82214/FULL/2014, Officers had significant concerns regarding the amenity for the residents of the proposed HMO, particularly in relation to the fully obscure glazed windows to the bedrooms, the proximity of the bedroom windows to the public footway resulting in a lack of privacy, noise and disturbance and the level of outdoor amenity space provided. The applicant has amended the proposal to include the installation of steel railings to the lower section of the bedroom windows on the side elevations. The steel railings would have a maximum height of 1.93m above ground level. An obscure glazed film is also proposed to the lower half of these windows, to a height of 1.72m above ground level and 1.58m above internal floor level. The opening of the windows would also be restricted. It is considered that these measures provide a more acceptable level of amenity for the occupants of the HMO, providing a level of privacy alongside an outlook and a barrier between the bedrooms and the public footpath.
13. The proposed HMO would include a 51.5m² outside courtyard, situated centrally within the building, which would provide the only area of outdoor amenity space for the residents. Whilst the Trafford Planning Guidelines: New Residential Development advise that 18m² of adequately screened communal area per flat should be provided for flat developments, it is considered that it is not always reasonable to require this level in town centre locations. Whilst this amended proposal would not provide a larger outside amenity area for the residents than what was previously proposed, the applicant has amended the proposal to include a higher quality of amenity space than previously proposed, including a grassed area with seating. It is also noted that the proposal reduces the number of bedrooms within the HMO from what was previously proposed, albeit only by one and therefore there would be fewer occupants using the amenity space than previously proposed. With regards to the small size of the living accommodation in some of the units, the Pollution and Licensing Section has commented that the proposal do meet Trafford's standards for HMOs.
14. It is therefore considered that the proposed amendments to the bedroom windows and private amenity space overcome the Officer's previous concerns and as such it is considered that the proposal would provide an acceptable level of amenity for the occupants of the proposed HMO and is therefore no longer a justified reason for refusal.

ACCESS AND PARKING

15. The last planning application 82214/FULL/2014 did not include the provision of any car parking and proposed inadequate cycle and motorcycle parking within the site. The applicant has amended the scheme to include two car parking spaces within the site. The LHA has raised no objection to the proposed spaces and notes that it is anticipated that the proposed residential accommodation is likely to appeal mainly to non-car owners, particularly due to the close proximity of good public transport and other amenities, particularly in the town centre.

Furthermore, the roads in the immediate vicinity of the site have restricted parking and the LHA advises that residents and other occupants of the development would not be eligible for permits for use within the nearby residents' parking zone. It is also considered that the development would generate less traffic and parking demand than the previous use of the site, though it is noted that the type of demand would be different to the existing as it includes residential accommodation, where demand is normally greater in the evenings and weekends.

16. Due to the location of the site close to Stretford Town Centre, adjacent to frequent services and a short distance from Stretford Metrolink Station, it is considered acceptable that no car parking is provided to serve the proposed small retail units. It is also recognised that no off-street car parking was provided for the existing lawful use of the site (a health centre) and as such the proposed commercial uses would have no greater demand for parking than the existing use. A condition is recommended requiring that the two car parking spaces are provided to serve the HMO only.
17. The application includes the provision of 10 cycle stands, which would be provided within a secure location within the internal courtyard. Motorcycle parking is also proposed within the application site to the front of the building. These arrangements are considered acceptable and in accordance with Policy L4 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Standards.
18. The last application was also recommended for refusal on the grounds that the applicant had failed to demonstrate that the proposed retail units could be serviced in a way that would not lead to congestion on Mitford Street, to the detriment of the free-flow of traffic and highway safety and the residential amenity of occupants of nearby houses. Under this application the applicant has submitted a servicing plan which shows that servicing would occur from the head of Bennett Street, which the LHA has confirmed is acceptable. It is therefore considered that the proposed commercial units would not result in servicing that would be detrimental to the free-flow of traffic, highway safety and residential amenity. As such it is considered that this previous reason for refusal has been overcome.
19. Concerns raised by a neighbouring resident and Councillor Adshead and Councillor Ross in regards to the impact of the proposal on local parking are noted. However, it is considered that the amended proposal would not result in an undue increase in parking demand on Mitford Street and neighbouring roads. The applicant has also demonstrated that the retail units can be serviced in an acceptable way that would not unduly impact on neighbouring residents.

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

20. The application includes the replacement of three windows on the south elevation, facing Kingsway, to provide larger openings to serve the proposed retail units. It became apparent during the site visit that the proposed windows have already been installed. The design of these windows are considered acceptable and in keeping with the host building.
21. The application also proposes the replacement of the remaining windows and doors, including the installation of new doors to the west side elevation providing a second access into the HMO which will allow for ease of access into the inner courtyard to the cycle stands and bin storage. The design of the windows and doors are considered acceptable and in keeping with the host building.
22. The windows to the bedrooms within the HMO on the east and west side elevations are proposed to have obscure glazing film and steel railings on the lower levels. It is considered that as these additions to the windows would be no greater than half the height of the windows, they would not detract from the appearance of the existing building or appear over dominant within the existing street scene. It is also considered that whilst railings are not often attractive features on windows, these are not the most prominent elevations of the building and the benefit that these features would provide to the amenity of the occupants of the HMO, particularly in regards to security and privacy, would outweigh any impact they may have on the appearance of the building. The applicant has stated that the railings to the windows would be colour treated dark grey. A condition is recommended requiring that the railings are colour treated accordingly and retained as such, which will help to soften their appearance against the building.
23. The application also includes the erection of 0.45m high railings above the existing 0.9m high boundary wall to the front (north) elevation, resulting in a maximum height of 1.35m. The railings are proposed to be simple in design and painted dark grey, which would match the railings on the windows to the windows on the east and west elevations. The design and height of the resulting wall and railings is considered acceptable and to not adversely impact on the existing street scene or character of the surrounding area.
24. The application proposes the siting of a refuse bin store to serve the HMO within the internal courtyard, which would be accessed by a new door on the west elevation, through the HMO. This is unlike the last planning application (82214/FULL/2014) where the bin stores were proposed to the front of the building. It is considered that the siting of the bin store within the internal courtyard would prevent refuse bins from being stored outside of the building, which has a detrimental impact on the existing street scene and character of the surrounding area. Due to the size of the units, the refuse relating to the proposed retail and office units would be stored inside of these units.

25. It is further considered that the proposal would bring what was a vacant premises back into active use, including providing an active frontage to Kingsway, which would have a positive impact on the existing street scene and character of the surrounding area.

PUBLIC SAFETY & SECURITY

26. The last planning application (82214/FULL/2014) was recommended for refusal, following concerns raised by Greater Manchester Police Design for Security, on the grounds that the proposed development and occupants would be vulnerable to criminal damage and anti-social behaviour as a result of a poor level of natural surveillance due to the high level of obscure glazed windows, and lack of any defensible space. It was considered that the proposed development failed to reduce opportunities for crime and would therefore have an adverse impact on public safety and the security interests of the future occupants of the proposed HMO and neighbouring residents.
27. Prior to the submission of this application, the applicants met with the Police to discuss their concerns and have proposed security measures accordingly in line with the Police's recommendation. These security measures and improvements include the installation of low level obscure glazing and steel railings, including restricted openings, to the bedroom windows on the east and west elevations where they are located adjacent to a public footpath; the siting of the bin stores within the inner courtyard; the erection of 0.45m high railings above the existing wall to the north boundary and information about the operating management of the HMO; and the provision of on-site car parking.
28. The amendments proposed to the bedroom windows on the east and west elevations allows for natural surveillance of the site and surrounding area, whilst also providing a degree of privacy for the occupants and screening of the occupants possessions. The Police previously advised that cars parked on street are more susceptible to crime, in particular cars that are parked remotely and not readily supervised by their owners. Through the provision of two car parking spaces and motorcycle parking to the front within the site, this concern has been overcome. It is also noted that the provision of the cycle parking for the HMO is to be provided within the inner courtyard, which is a more secure location and deters criminal activity.
29. As a result of these security measures the Greater Manchester Police Design for Security team raise no objections to this planning application providing a condition is attached if planning permission is granted, which requires the applicant to implement the security measures within 3 months of the date of approval. Such a condition is therefore recommended.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

30. This proposal is subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and is located in the 'cold zone' for residential development, consequently it will be liable to a CIL charge rate of £20 per square metre, in line with Trafford's CIL charging schedule and revised SPD1: Planning Obligations (2014). The proposed retail development will be liable to a CIL charge rate of £0 per square metre.

CONCLUSION

31. It is considered that the applicant has addressed the previous five recommended reasons for refusal. As such it is considered that the proposal provides an acceptable level of amenity for the occupants of the HMO and would not unduly impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents. The amended proposal would reduce opportunities for crime and antisocial behaviour associated with the development. The design of the proposed development is considered acceptable and to not detract from the appearance of the host building or adversely impact on the existing street scene and character of the surrounding area. The proposal would also provide an acceptable level of car, cycle and motorcycle parking within the site to serve the proposed HMO. The applicant has also demonstrated that the proposed retail units can be serviced in an acceptable way that would not adversely impact on highway safety and the amenity of neighbouring residents. As such an approval with conditions is recommended.


RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions

1. Standard Time Limit
2. List of Approved Plans
3. Materials in accordance with approved plans
4. Railings on the windows and wall to be colour treated prior to installation
5. Crime prevention measures including security measures to the bedroom windows shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans within 3 months of the date of the planning permission.
6. Creation and retention of car, motorcycle and car parking.
7. The car parking spaces shall be made available for the residential accommodation only.
8. Opening hours of retail units: 08:00 – 18:00 Mondays to Saturdays and 09:00 – 16:00 on Sundays
9. Servicing carried out in accordance with approved plan

VW



Mitford Lodge, 90 Mitford Street, Stretford (site hatched on plan)



Scale: 1:1,250

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright 2012.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Organisation	Trafford Council
Department	Planning Service
Comments	Committee date 9/07/2015
Date	29/06/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

WARD: Stretford

84979/FUL/15

DEPARTURE: No

Conversion of former Health Centre into a House of Multiple Occupation (6 bed), 2no. offices (Use Class B1) fronting Mitford Street and 2no. retail (Use Class A1) units fronting Kingsway, with ancillary parking, bin storage and communal courtyard and external alterations to window arrangements.

Mitford Lodge, 90 Mitford Street, Stretford, M32 8AQ

APPLICANT: Acamba Systems

AGENT: Nick Howard Planning

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

SITE

The application relates to a single storey building, which was formally occupied as a health centre with ten consultant rooms and a dental suite. The building fronts Mitford Street and Kingsway is situated to the south of the site. Residential properties on Mitford Street are situated opposite the site, to the north. Offices to a home care agency and a large electricity substation are situated to the west of the site and an open public garden is situated to the east. Stretford Mall and a pedestrian subway underneath Kingsway are situated to the south of the site. Public footpaths are situated immediately adjacent to the building to the east and west of the site.

The building has been unlawfully converted into an 11 bed house of multiple occupation (HMO) and two commercial units. One of these units is operating as a barbers shop and the other as a hot food takeaway.

PROPOSAL

The application proposes the change of use from a health centre to a House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) with 6 bedrooms (Use Class C4) and two small retail units (Use Class A1) and two small offices (Use Class B1). One of the retail units would have a floor area of 52m² and another would have a floor area of 46m². One of the office units would have a floor area of 36m² and the second would have a floor area of 33m². The HMO would also include communal facilities comprising of two kitchens, a lounge and a dining room. The bedrooms would range in size from 14.3m² to 28.1m², each of which would include en-suite facilities. An existing internal courtyard within the building would serve the proposed HMO, providing a seating and grassed area, cycle parking and bin storage.

The application also proposes the replacement of existing windows and doors, including the installation of new doors to the side elevations providing independent access to the

proposed offices. Changes to the window designs including the installation of obscure glazing and steel railings to the lower levels of the windows on the east and west side elevations.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**, adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 1st April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2013 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L1 – Land for New Homes

L2 – Meeting Housing

L4 – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

L7 – Design

W1 - Economy

W2 – Town Centres and Retail

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

Unallocated

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

None

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

84968/FUL/15 - Conversion of former Health Centre into a House of Multiple Occupation (10 bed) and 2no. retail units (Use Class A1) fronting Kingsway, with associated parking, bin storage and communal courtyard and external alterations to window arrangements – This application is recommended for approval and is also being considered by the Planning Committee under the same agenda.

82214/FULL/2014 - Conversion of former health centre into a house in multiple occupation (11-bed) with 2no. retail units (Use Class A1) fronting Kingsway. External alterations to alter window arrangement – This application was withdrawn by the applicant after it was recommended to be refused.

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has submitted a Planning Statement, a Design and Access Statement, a Management Plan, a Servicing Plan and details of a public consultation that they have carried out to accompany the application. The information provided within these statements is referred to where relevant within this report.

CONSULTATIONS

Economic Growth – Raise concerns in relation to the proposed residential accommodation. The Stretford Town Centre Masterplan identifies the site for new residential development and the principle of bringing this site back into use is supported. They note that the Greater Manchester SHMA recognised that alongside a sustained emphasis on the development of family housing it is important that the town centres across the Borough continue to attract high quality residential uses. This will continue to ensure the on-going renaissance of the town centres and ensure that they continue to develop as vibrant centres of activity. They do not consider that the proposed development meets this objective as it does not provide for high quality residential uses or housing suitable for families. Furthermore the conversion of this single storey building does not provide optimum use of the site or the density of development appropriate within the urban area / a town centre location adjoining high density residential development. No objections are raised in regards to the proposed retail units.

LHA – No objections, full comments are discussed in the Observations section of this report.

Pollution & Licensing – No objections, recommend that the hours of use of the retail and office units are restricted to day time hours.

Greater Manchester Police Design for Security – No objections. They have met with the developer and talked through their original objections (to the previous planning

application 82214/FULL/2014). All of the measures suggested by Design for Security have been incorporated into the scheme. A condition is recommended requiring that the security measures proposed are implemented in accordance with the approved plan within 3 months of the application being approved.

Electricity North West – No objections, standing advice relating to development on land adjacent to their infrastructure is provided.

REPRESENTATIONS

One letter of objection has been received from a neighbouring resident of Mitford Street, which raises the following concerns: -

- The type of tenants targeted by HMOs are often those most vulnerable within society. Consider that the applicant is not dedicated to the site, having previously put the site up for auction prior to the application.
- Poor level of amenity for the tenants. Overflowing bins demonstrates a contempt to provide for their needs and the environment of its neighbours
- It has dramatically impacted on the feel of Mitford Street for the worse.
- Incidents witnessed include residents have parking without permits, misuse of the disabled bay in front of the building, fights and rows held in the street by residents or their visitors, use of illegal drugs openly on a residential street.
- The fact the developers have submitted two applications demonstrates that it is only a money making exercise.

Councillor Adshead and Councillor Ross have requested that their previous comments and objections to the last application (82214/FULL/2014) are taken into account for this application as they do not see a change from the previous proposal. Their concerns are: -

- The site is included in the Stretford Masterplan area; as this is a key location, concerned that the proposal is dominated by an 11 bedroom HMO and feel that this does not tie in with the long term aims of the masterplan.
- The impact of the proposal on local parking.
- Consider that whilst proposals for business units are welcome, consideration needs to be given in regards to what type of businesses are proposed and how they fit strategically within the masterplan.

OBSERVATIONS

BACKGROUND

1. This application has been submitted following the withdrawal of a previous application ref: 82214/FULL/2014, which proposed the conversion of the former health centre into a house in multiple occupation (11-bed) with 2no. retail units (Use Class A1) fronting Kingsway, with external alterations to alter window

arrangements. This application was presented to the Planning Committee in July 2014, with a recommendation of refusal for the following reasons: -

- The proposed development would result in an unacceptable level of residential amenity for future occupiers of the proposed HMO as a result of a combination of the size of living accommodation, lack of outdoor amenity space, obscure glazing to bedroom windows, restricted outlook and proximity of bedroom windows to public footway resulting in a lack of privacy, noise and disturbance. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies L2 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's Planning Guidelines: New Residential Development.
 - The proposed development and occupants would be vulnerable to criminal damage and anti-social behaviour as a result of a poor level of natural surveillance due to the high level of obscure glazed windows, and lack of any defensible space due to the fact that there are public footpaths immediately adjacent on three sides of the building and due to the positioning of windows on these elevations. As such the proposed development fails to reduce opportunities for crime and would therefore have an adverse impact on public safety and the security interests of the future occupants of the proposed HMO and neighbouring residents. Therefore the development would be contrary to Policies L2 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's Planning Guidelines, New Residential Development.
 - No specific provision of refuse storage for the retail units and inadequate and poorly located provision of refuse storage for the residential units would result in visual harm, detracting from the street scene and character of the area and poor environmental standards which can lead to criminal and antisocial behaviour. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies L2 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's Planning Guidelines, New Residential Development.
 - The proposal fails to provide adequate off road car parking provision and cycle storage for the proposed development and thus would lead to on street car parking to the detriment of the residential amenity of the occupants of nearby houses. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies L2, L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Standards.
 - The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed retail units could be serviced in a way that would not lead to congestion on Mitford Street, to the detriment of the free-flow of traffic and highway safety and the residential amenity of occupants of nearby houses. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy.
2. The applicant chose to withdraw the application prior to the Planning Committee meeting.

3. This planning application seeks a revised proposal, which the applicant considers addresses these previous recommended reasons for refusal. Officers also consider that the applicant has addressed these reasons for refusal and the reasons for this are discussed in the report below.

PRINCIPLE OF PROPOSAL

4. The application proposes the creation of residential accommodation, retail and office floor space. The application site is not specifically allocated in the Revised Adopted Trafford Unitary Development Plan (2006) although it is identified in the Consultation Draft Land Allocations Plan (January 2014) under Policy TC1 as being within the Stretford Town Centre boundary and under Policy STR1.2 – Land at Bennett Street Action Area as being suitable for residential development. While this plan is still at the very earliest stage of production and consultation, the identification of this site under the above policies should be regarded as a material consideration, albeit of limited weight.
5. The Stretford Town Centre Masterplan also identifies the application site for new residential development and the principle of bringing the site back into use is supported. The primary objective of the Masterplan is to secure the successful regeneration of Stretford Town Centre and relevant objectives are:
 - MO1: To bring forward sustainable development that realises the full potential of Stretford Town Centre and the surrounding area.
 - MO8: To provide residential development and a better balance in housing types.
6. It is noted that the Greater Manchester Strategic Housing Market Assessment recognises that alongside a sustained emphasis on the development of family housing it is important that the town centres across the Borough continue to attract high quality residential uses. This is to assist the on-going renaissance of the town centres and ensure that they continue to develop as vibrant centres of activity. It is recognised that the proposal does not provide high quality residential accommodation or housing suitable for families.
7. Policy L1 of the Core Strategy seeks to release sufficient land to accommodate 12,210 new dwellings (net of clearance) over the plan period up to 2026. Regular monitoring has revealed that despite maintaining a five year housing land supply in accordance with government guidance, the actual rate of building is failing to meet the housing land target as expressed in Table L1 of the Core Strategy. Therefore, there exists a significant need to not only meet the level of housing land supply identified within Policy L1 of the Core Strategy, but also to make up for a recent shortfall in housing completions. It is therefore considered that despite the proposal not providing high quality residential accommodation or family housing, the proposal would make a positive contribution to the Council's

housing land supply and in addition the proposal will contribute to meeting targets for the development of brownfield land (Policy L1.7).

8. Policy L2.6 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that proposals contribute to meeting the housing needs of the Borough. Whilst the proposal is for a very large House in Multiple Occupation, it is considered that it will go some way to meeting a need in the Borough, albeit one that is not specifically identified in the Core Strategy. The principle of residential development on the site is therefore considered acceptable.
9. In regards to the proposed retail and office development, the site is not located within any of the town, district, local or neighbourhood shopping centres. Policy W2.12 states that outside of these centres there will be a presumption against the development of retail, leisure and other town centre-type uses except where it can be demonstrated that they satisfy the tests outlined in current Government Guidance. The retail and office units proposed as part of the development are of a modest scale and are immediately adjacent to the existing Stretford Town Centre boundary (and proposed for inclusion within in the Consultation Draft Land Allocations Plan). As such, it is considered that the proposal will support the vitality and viability of Stretford Town Centre and is consistent with Core Strategy Policy W2.12. The proposed retail units would also not undermine the Masterplan objectives as they would complement the existing retail and service provision within the town centre. It is also considered that although there is vacant floorspace within Stretford Mall (the town centre core), the Masterplan recognises that the successful regeneration of the town centre will require an increase in active frontages along Kingsway which has the potential to make the area more attractive and contribute to the aspirations of reducing the severance caused by Kingsway. The proposed retail and office units are therefore also considered acceptable in principle.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

10. A minimum distance of 15.5m lies between the building and the neighbouring residential properties on the northern side of Mitford Street. The windows on the northern elevation would serve offices and two bedroom windows within the proposed HMO. A minimum distance of 19.5m would lie between the bedroom windows and neighbouring properties and a distance of 15.5m between the office windows and neighbouring properties. These separation distances are typical of those between terraced properties on Mitford Street and the surrounding area and there were windows in the former health centre on this elevation. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in a loss of privacy to neighbouring residents.
11. The proposed retail units are situated to the south of the building, facing Stretford Mall, away from neighbouring residential properties. The units would front a busy highway. It is therefore considered that these units would not result in undue

noise and disturbance to existing neighbouring residential properties on Mitford Street. The applicant has not detailed proposed opening hours of these units, however it is considered that due to the size of the units and the close proximity of the site to Stretford Town Centre, it is also considered that the proposed commercial units would not unduly impact on the occupants of the proposed adjoining HMO. If Committee were minded to approve the application, then it is recommended that the opening hours of these retail units are restricted to prevent undue noise and disturbance to the residents of the HMO during night time hours.

12. The proposed office units are likely to be predominantly day time uses, which are considered to have no greater impact on the neighbouring residents than the lawful use of the site as a health centre. It is also considered that due to the small size of these office units, they would not result in a high level of comings and goings to the site and therefore would also not result in undue noise and disturbance to the occupants of the proposed HMO.
13. Under the last planning application 82214/FULL/2014, Officers had significant concerns regarding the amenity for the residents of the proposed HMO, particularly in relation to the fully obscure glazed windows to the bedrooms, the proximity of the bedroom windows to the public footway resulting in a lack of privacy, noise and disturbance and the level of outdoor amenity space provided. The applicant has amended the proposal to include the installation of steel railings to the lower section of the bedroom windows on the side elevations. The steel railings would have a maximum height of 1.93m above ground level. An obscure glazed film is also proposed to the lower half of these windows, to a height of 1.72m above ground level and 1.58m above internal floor level. The opening of the windows would also be restricted. It is considered that these measures provide a more acceptable level of amenity for the occupants of the HMO, providing a level of privacy alongside an outlook and a barrier between the bedrooms and the public footpath.
14. The proposed HMO would include a 51.5m² outside courtyard, situated centrally within the building, which would provide the only area of outdoor amenity space for the residents. Whilst the Trafford Planning Guidelines: New Residential Development advise that 18m² of adequately screened communal area per flat should be provided for flat developments, it is considered that it is not always reasonable to require this level in town centre locations. Whilst this amended proposal would not provide a larger outside amenity area for the residents than what was previously proposed, the applicant has amended the proposal to include a higher quality of amenity space than previously proposed, including a grassed area with seating. It is also noted that the proposal reduces the number of bedrooms within the HMO from what was previously proposed and therefore there would be fewer occupants using the amenity space than previously proposed. With regards to the small size of the living accommodation in some of

the units, the Pollution and Licensing Section has commented that the proposals do meet Trafford's standards for HMOs.

15. It is therefore considered that the proposed amendments to the bedroom windows and private amenity space overcome the Officer's previous concerns and as such it is considered that the proposal would provide an acceptable level of amenity for the occupants of the proposed HMO and is therefore no longer a justified reason for refusal.

ACCESS AND PARKING

16. The last planning application 82214/FULL/2014 did not include the provision of any car parking and proposed inadequate cycle and motorcycle parking within the site. The applicant has amended the scheme to include two car parking spaces within the site. The LHA has raised no objection to the proposed spaces and notes that it is anticipated that the proposed residential accommodation is likely to appeal mainly to non-car owners, particularly due to the close proximity of good public transport and other amenities, particularly in the town centre. Furthermore, the roads in the immediate vicinity of the site have restricted parking and the LHA advises that residents and other occupants of the development would not be eligible for permits for use within the nearby residents' parking zone. It is also considered that the development would generate less traffic and parking demand than the previous use of the site, though it is noted that the type of demand would be different to the existing as it includes residential accommodation, where demand is normally greater in the evenings and weekends.
17. Due to the location of the site close to Stretford Town Centre, adjacent to frequent services and a short distance from Stretford Metrolink Station, it is considered acceptable that no car parking is provided to serve the proposed small retail and office units. It is also recognised that no off-street car parking was provided for the existing lawful use of the site (a health centre) and as such the proposed commercial uses would have no greater demand for parking than the existing use. A condition is recommended requiring that the two car parking spaces are provided to serve the HMO only.
18. The application includes the provision of 6 cycle stands, which would be provided within a secure location within the internal courtyard. Motorcycle parking is also proposed within the application site to the front of the building. These arrangements are considered acceptable and in accordance with Policy L4 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Standards.
19. The last application was also recommended for refusal on the grounds that the applicant had failed to demonstrate that the proposed retail units could be serviced in a way that would not lead to congestion on Mitford Street, to the

detriment of the free-flow of traffic and highway safety and the residential amenity of occupants of nearby houses. Under this application the applicant has submitted a servicing plan which shows that servicing would occur from the head of Bennett Street, which the LHA has confirmed is acceptable. It is therefore considered that the proposed commercial units would not result in servicing that would be detrimental to the free-flow of traffic, highway safety and residential amenity. As such it is considered that this previous reason for refusal has been overcome.

20. Concerns raised by a neighbouring resident and Councillor Adshead and Councillor Ross in regards to the impact of the proposal on local parking are noted. However, it is considered that the amended proposal would not result in an undue increase in parking demand on Mitford Street and neighbouring roads. The applicant has also demonstrated that the retail and office units can be serviced in an acceptable way that would not unduly impact on neighbouring residents.

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

21. The application includes the replacement of three windows on the south elevation, facing Kingsway, to provide larger openings to serve the proposed retail units. It became apparent during the site visit that the proposed windows have already been installed. The design of these windows are considered acceptable and in keeping with the host building.
22. The application also proposes the replacement of the remaining windows and doors, including the installation of new doors to the side elevations providing independent access to the proposed offices and new doors to the west side elevation providing a second access into the HMO which will allow for ease of access into the inner courtyard to the cycle stands and bin storage. The design of the windows and doors are considered acceptable and in keeping with the host building.
23. The windows to the bedrooms within the HMO on the east and west side elevations are proposed to have obscure glazing film and steel railings on the lower levels. It is considered that as these additions to the windows would be no greater than half the height of the windows, they would not detract from the appearance of the existing building or appear over dominant within the existing street scene. It is also considered that whilst railings are not often attractive features on windows, these are not the most prominent elevations of the building and the benefit that these features would provide to the amenity of the occupants of the HMO, particularly in regards to security and privacy, would outweigh any impact they may have on the appearance of the building. The applicant has stated that the railings to the windows would be colour treated dark grey. A condition is recommended requiring that the railings are colour treated

accordingly and retained as such, which will help to soften their appearance against the building.

24. The application also includes the erection of 0.45m high railings above the existing 0.9m high boundary wall to the front (north) elevation, resulting in a maximum height of 1.35m. The railings are proposed to be simple in design and painted dark grey, which would match the railings on the windows to the windows on the east and west elevations. The design and height of the resulting wall and railings is considered acceptable and to not adversely impact on the existing street scene or character of the surrounding area.
25. The application proposes the siting of a refuse bin store to serve the HMO within the internal courtyard, which would be accessed by a new door on the west elevation, through the HMO. This is unlike the last planning application (82214/FULL/2014) where the bin stores were proposed to the front of the building. It is considered that the siting of the bin store within the internal courtyard would prevent refuse bins from being stored outside of the building, which has a detrimental impact on the existing street scene and character of the surrounding area. Due to the size of the units, the refuse relating to the proposed retail and office units would be stored inside of these units.
26. It is further considered that the proposal would bring what was a vacant premises back into active use, including providing an active frontage to Kingsway, which would have a positive impact on the existing street scene and character of the surrounding area.

PUBLIC SAFETY & SECURITY

27. The last planning application (82214/FULL/2014) was recommended for refusal, following concerns raised by Greater Manchester Police Design for Security, on the grounds that the proposed development and occupants would be vulnerable to criminal damage and anti-social behaviour as a result of a poor level of natural surveillance due to the high level of obscure glazed windows, and lack of any defensible space. It was considered that the proposed development failed to reduce opportunities for crime and would therefore have an adverse impact on public safety and the security interests of the future occupants of the proposed HMO and neighbouring residents.
28. Prior to the submission of this application, the applicants met with the Police to discuss their concerns and have proposed security measures accordingly in line with the Police's recommendation. These security measures and improvements include the installation of low level obscure glazing and steel railings, including restricted openings, to the bedroom windows on the east and west elevations where they are located adjacent to a public footpath; the siting of the bin stores within the inner courtyard; the erection of 0.45m high railings above the existing

wall to the north boundary and information about the operating management of the HMO; and the provision of on-site car parking.

29. The amendments proposed to the bedroom windows on the east and west elevations allows for natural surveillance of the site and surrounding area, whilst also providing a degree of privacy for the occupants and screening of the occupants possessions. The Police previously advised that cars parked on street are more susceptible to crime, in particular cars that are parked remotely and not readily supervised by their owners. Through the provision of two car parking spaces and motorcycle parking to the front within the site, this concern has been overcome. It is also noted that the provision of the cycle parking for the HMO is to be provided within the inner courtyard, which is a more secure location and deters criminal activity.
30. As a result of these security measures the Greater Manchester Police Design for Security team raise no objections to this planning application providing a condition is attached if planning permission is granted, which requires the applicant to implement the security measures within 3 months of the date of approval. Such a condition is therefore recommended.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

31. This proposal is subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and is located in the 'cold zone' for residential development, consequently it will be liable to a CIL charge rate of £20 per square metre, in line with Trafford's CIL charging schedule and revised SPD1: Planning Obligations (2014). The commercial elements of the proposal development will be liable to a CIL charge rate of £0 per square metre.

CONCLUSION

32. It is considered that the applicant has addressed the previous five recommended reasons for refusal. As such it is considered that the proposal provides an acceptable level of amenity for the occupants of the HMO and would not unduly impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents. The amended proposal would reduce opportunities for crime and antisocial behaviour associated with the development. The design of the proposed development is considered acceptable and to not detract from the appearance of the host building or adversely impact on the existing street scene and character of the surrounding area. The proposal would also provide an acceptable level of car, cycle and motorcycle parking within the site to serve the proposed HMO. The applicant has also demonstrated that the proposed retail and office units can be serviced in an acceptable way that would not adversely impact on highway safety and the amenity of neighbouring residents. As such an approval with conditions is recommended.


RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions

1. Standard Time Limit
2. List of Approved Plans
3. Materials in accordance with approved plans
4. Railings on the windows and wall to be colour treated prior to installation
5. Crime prevention measures including security measures to the bedroom windows shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans within 3 months of the date of the planning permission.
6. Creation and retention of car, motorcycle and car parking.
7. The car parking spaces shall be made available for the residential accommodation only.
8. Opening hours of retail units: 08:00 – 18:00 Mondays to Saturdays and 09:00 – 16:00 on Sundays
9. Servicing carried out in accordance with approved plan

VW



Mitford Lodge, 90 Mitford Street, Stretford (site hatched on plan)



Scale: 1:1,250

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright 2012.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Organisation	Trafford Council
Department	Planning Service
Comments	Committee date 9/07/2015
Date	29/06/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

Erection of part 3 storey part 4 storey building to provide 13 no. apartments.

Land Between Grosvenor House And 11A Goose Green, Back Grafton Street,
Altrincham, WA14 1DW

APPLICANT: Ludstone Developments Limited

AGENT: Paul Butler Associates Ltd

RECOMMENDATION: MINDED TO GRANT

SITE

The site is located on the eastern side of Back Grafton Street and to the north east of Goose Green within Altrincham Town Centre. The site extends to approximately 0.2 ha and is currently vacant and hardsurfaced, with temporary fencing to Back Grafton Street and the rear boundary. The site was previously occupied by two single storey buildings and an enclosed and covered courtyard and which was in use as a commercial garage premises. The buildings were in poor condition and were demolished from December 2014.

The site is situated between a three storey property in use as offices (Grosvenor House) and a two storey building in use as offices (11a Goose Green). There is a fall in level to the rear of the site where there is a car park and four storey apartments (Olivier House). The area is commercial in character with office, retail and food and drink uses in the immediate locality.

The site is within the Goose Green Conservation Area (following an extension to its boundary in 2014) and adjoins the Stamford New Road Conservation Area which extends up to the north east side boundary of the site and includes Grosvenor House. The SPD for the Goose Green Conservation Area states the special interest of the Conservation Area derives from the following elements: -

- It retains both the feeling of enclosure and that of an artisan locality and its structures document the development of Altrincham;
- Properties located within and adjacent to Goose Green are modest in scale, architectural detail and retain the plan form of historic workshops. These details give the area a high level of historic character;
- The palette of building materials and local details repeated throughout the Conservation Area gives the area a sense of visual harmony;
- The feeling of enclosure provided by the buildings surrounding Goose Green contrasts to the hectic environment of Stamford New Road and Railway Street to

the north and north west respectively. This differentiates between the different phases of Altrincham's development;

- The lane providing access from Railway Street located to the north west of the Conservation Area, is an historic route from the Old Market Place in Higher Town, through Lower Town (George Street) and the hamlet of Goose Green leading on to Hale Moss, an area of both market gardens and common land;
- The Conservation Area represents a good example of the use of appropriate shop front design.

The SPD states properties are predominantly Georgian and Victorian converted terraced dwellings exhibiting a vernacular character. The buildings are constructed from brick, over two or three storeys; with timber framed sash or casement windows, timber doors and door surrounds and blue slate roofs. Numbers 10a and 11a Goose Green (adjacent to the site) utilise traditional materials, form and detailing such as sash windows and soldier courses over arched openings.

The SPD for the Stamford New Road Conservation Area states buildings in Back Grafton Street and Grafton Street are simpler in design and scale compared to those on Stamford New Road, of historic interest and function with road surfaces consisting of stone setts. It identifies the view along Grafton Street towards Grosvenor House, 22 Grafton Street as one of the key views within the Conservation Area.

PROPOSAL

Permission is sought for the erection of a part 3 storey and part 4 storey building which provides accommodation over 4 floors to provide 13 x 1-bed apartments. It comprises three floors to the front and four to the rear although both elevations retain a 3 storey appearance, with the top floor in the rear section largely within the roofspace. Due to the difference in level between Back Grafton Street and the land to the rear, the floor level at the rear is lower than at the front. The application does not include any car parking for the development. A secure cycle store is provided on the ground floor providing 12 spaces (there would also be space for 2 cycles on the lower ground floor) and an internal bin store is also provided at the front of the building with doors onto Back Grafton Street.

Amended plans have been submitted in response to concerns over the height and design of the originally submitted scheme. In summary the amended plans reduce the height of the building and amend the Back Grafton Street elevation from part 3/part 4 storey to 3 storey and the rear elevation from 4 storey to 3 storey (with accommodation in the roofspace), replace flat roofs with pitched roofs, replace render to the front elevation with brick and omit two gables from the rear elevation. The amendments have resulted in a reduction from 14 to 13 apartments.

The total floorspace of the proposed development would be 716 m².

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**, adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 1st April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2013 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L1 – Land for New Homes
L2 – Meeting Housing Needs
L4 – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility
L5 – Climate Change
L7 – Design
L8 – Planning Obligations
W1 - Economy
W2 – Town Centres & Retail
R1 – Historic Environment
R2 – Natural Environment
R3 – Green Infrastructure

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

Conservation Area
Town and District Shopping Centre / Area for Improvement
Main Office Development Area

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

ENV21 – Conservation Areas
H4 – Release of Other Land for Development
S6 – Development in Altrincham Town Centre

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE

Goose Green Conservation Area - Supplementary Planning Document SPD5.2
Stamford New Road Conservation Area - Supplementary Planning Document SPD5.4
Planning Guidelines - New Residential Development
SPD1 – Planning Obligations

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

79441/FULL/2012 - Demolition of existing buildings and change of use of site to car park for 8 vehicles, including formation of temporary surface. Refused 21/12/12 and Appeal allowed 17/07/13

75536/RENEWAL/2010 - Application to extend the time limit for implementation of planning permission ref H/67520 (demolition of existing garage/workshop and erection of a 5 storey building, inclusive of basement and roofspace levels, comprising 9 no. apartments). Approved 07/09/10

H/67520 – Demolition of existing garage/workshop and erection of a 5 storey building (inclusive of basement and roofspace levels) comprising 9 no. apartments.
Approved 08/02/08

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

A Planning and Heritage Statement, Design and Access Statement, Crime Impact Statement, Environmental Noise Assessment, Phase 1 Desktop Study Report and Carbon Budget Statement have been submitted in support of the scheme and are referred to where relevant in the Observations below. The key points are summarised as follows: -

- The principle of residential use is wholly appropriate in that it makes best use of previously developed land; residential uses are already present in the immediate surrounding area; the site is located within Altrincham Town Centre; and is accessible by various modes of public transport.
- The scheme is within the broad parameters previously established by planning permission H/67520.
- In terms of its height and massing the proposal will reflect buildings within the local area and will contribute to the varied roofscape along Back Grafton Street.
- The fenestration will reflect that of the neighbouring properties in terms of height, width and position and will maintain the rhythm of Back Grafton Street.
- The separation distance to Olivier House is considered more than adequate to ensure no detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity. Similar separation distances were previously accepted by the Council under permission H/67520.

- Due to the site's highly accessible and sustainable location within the town centre no car parking is proposed as part of the scheme.
- The link between Goose Green and the town centre will be greatly improved and will add to the characteristic of the area. Redevelopment continues the regeneration of Back Grafton Street and Goose Green.
- The proposal is a sympathetic intervention that reflects but does not seek to copy existing buildings within the conservation area, by the use of certain materials such as red brick, red sandstone and Welsh slate.
- Special attention has been taken to ensure the scheme has kept similarities with the principles of mass, scale, use and appearance from the previously approved application.

CONSULTATIONS

LHA – No objections and consider that no car parking provision would be acceptable in this location. Comments summarised in the Observations section of this report.

Pollution and Licensing – No comments received at time of preparing this report.

GM Archaeological Advisory Service – No objections. Comment that the proposed development does not threaten the known or suspected archaeological heritage and on this basis there is no need to impose any archaeological requirements upon the applicant.

GMP (Design for Security) - No comments received at time of preparing this report.

Altrincham Town Centre Business Neighbourhood Forum - supportive of residential development but make the general observation that applicants need to recognize that in introducing residential into an active town centre means that they and the subsequent owners or occupiers also need to recognize the reality of living in town.

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbours – 3 letters of objection received to the originally submitted plans, summarised as follows:-

- Building up to 4 storeys will be out of line with adjacent buildings on Back Grafton Street and out of keeping with the rest of Goose Green.
- No parking is proposed which will cause major disruption if residents from the flats start parking in Denmark Street.
- Overlooking of bedrooms and living areas in Olivier House resulting in loss of privacy.
- Access and possible parking will be an obstruction to present flow of traffic on Goose Green and Grafton Street. There are existing problems and danger to the public as there are no pavements on Back Grafton Street. An additional 14 apartments will only add to the situation.

- Concerns over the height of the proposals, the treatment of the Olivier House/Denmark Street elevation and impact on properties in Olivier House. Note the previously approved elevation has been '*redrawn and adjusted*' in the Design and Access Statement to '*meet standard construction dimensions*' (height has been increased) and then used as a comparison with the current proposals.
- From the information provided it is not possible to compare the approved and proposed heights of either elevation. Comparative drawings are requested that show the approved height and the proposed height (a plan has since been received).

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

1. The NPPF includes within its core planning principles the need to deliver the homes that are needed and states housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Policy L2 of the Core Strategy (Meeting Housing Needs) states that all new residential development proposals will be assessed for the contribution that will be made to meeting the housing needs of the Borough and the wider aspirations of the Council's Sustainable Community Strategy. Of relevance to this application it requires new development to be appropriately located in terms of access to existing community facilities and/or delivers complementary improvements to the social infrastructure, not harmful to the character or amenity of the immediately surrounding area and in accordance with Policy L7 (Design) and other relevant policies within the Development Plan.

Proposed Residential Development

2. The site was until relatively recently occupied by buildings and is currently hard surfaced, therefore constitutes previously developed land. It is within a highly sustainable location where comprehensive services and facilities are available. The site is well served by public transport, being within walking distance of Altrincham Interchange where frequent bus, Metrolink and rail services are available.
3. It is also considered that residential development in an appropriate form provides an opportunity to enhance the appearance of this site and its contribution to the appearance of the area; the site is currently vacant and as a gap site it detracts from the character of the area. The site is specifically referred to in the Goose Green Conservation Area SPD which states "*the former garage site on Back Grafton Street, next to No. 22 Back Grafton Street is a potential development site*".
4. The proposed scheme is for 13 x one bedroom apartments. Core Strategy Policy L2 makes it clear that one bed general needs accommodation will normally only be acceptable for schemes that support the regeneration of Trafford's town

5. centres and the Regional Centre. This proposal is within Altrincham town centre and it is considered that this proposal could have a positive role in both maintaining the centre's vitality and viability in assisting the Council achieving its overall housing land supply target.
6. The proposed scheme is located within a hot market location and would therefore be expected to contribute 5 affordable dwellings (40% of the overall development quantum) to contribute towards the need for affordable housing need in the Altrincham area. The applicant has submitted a development appraisal which concludes that no affordable housing can be provided. This is considered further below.
7. The principle of the development is therefore in accordance with the NPPF and the Trafford Core Strategy (Policy L2 and Strategic Objective SO1) and there is no land use policy objection to the proposal.

Loss of Employment Land

8. The site was formerly in employment use, having previously been occupied by a garage business and although now vacant it constitutes employment land by virtue of this last active use. Paragraphs 18 to 22 of the NPPF make it clear the emphasis that the government places on supporting sustainable economic growth. However, notwithstanding this support, paragraph 22 of NPPF deals specifically with the issue of considering non employment uses on existing employment sites. It states that planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities. In respect of applications such as this, (on an unallocated employment site within a town centre) Policy W1.12 of the Adopted Core Strategy would normally require developers to provide a statement justifying the loss of employment land. However, the previous planning permission established the principle of residential development on this site. It is considered there have not been any material changes to alter this conclusion. Indeed the NPPF recognises the important role that residential development can play in ensuring the vitality of centres. Therefore the loss of employment land is considered acceptable and in this instance it would not be appropriate to require an employment land assessment from the applicant.

IMPACT IN THE STREET SCENE AND ON THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE CONSERVATION AREAS

9. The site is within the Goose Green Conservation Area and adjoins the Stamford New Road Conservation Area. Policy R1 (Historic Environment) requires all new development to take account of surrounding building styles, landscapes and historic distinctiveness. It states developers must demonstrate how the development will complement and enhance the existing features of historic significance including their wider settings, in particular in relation to conservation areas, listed buildings and other identified heritage assets. Policy L7 (Design) states that in relation to matters of design, development must be appropriate in its context; make best use of opportunities to improve the character and quality of an area; enhance the street scene or character of the area by appropriately addressing scale, density, height, massing, layout, elevation treatment, materials, hard and soft landscaping work, boundary treatment; and make appropriate provision for open space where appropriate.
10. The Conservation Areas constitute designated heritage assets and therefore the following guidance in the NPPF is relevant: - *“When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification”* (Paragraph 132).

The NPPF states that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness (Paragraph 131).

The NPPF also states local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably (Paragraph 137).

11. The site is specifically referred to in the SPD for the Goose Green Conservation Area as a potential development site. The SPD refers to the previous structure on the site as a positive contributor, retaining the historic building line along Back Grafton Street leading to Stamford New Road Conservation Area and thus classed as a non-designated heritage asset. Although this structure has since been demolished, the fact that the site has historically been occupied by

buildings and that in doing so it made a positive contribution to the character of the area, the principle of infilling between the existing buildings and up to the historic building line is acceptable.

Scale and height

12. The proposed building takes the form of a square block covering all the available site area. It comprises three floors to the front and four to the rear, although both elevations retain a 3 storey appearance. Due to the difference in level between Back Grafton Street and the land to the rear the floor levels are lower in the rear section of the building, with a lower ground floor in the rear section.
13. The elevation to Back Grafton Street would be 8.4m high to eaves and 11.1m to the ridge. This would be taller than the buildings on either side; 1.4m higher than Grosvenor House and 3.7m higher than 11a Goose Green. Permission has previously been granted for a 3 to 5 storey building on the site that would be 7.5m high to eaves and 8.8m to ridge (left-hand side) and 7.7m to eaves and 10.4m to ridge (right hand side). Whilst the proposed building would be higher it would nevertheless be similar to the height and massing of the previously approved scheme and it is acknowledged there are other buildings of 3 or more storeys in the immediate locality, including Grosvenor House adjoining the site (3 storey), 5 Grafton Street opposite (3 storey) and Olivier House to the rear (4 storey).
14. The proposed building would also be prominent from the rear and from the bridge between Goose Green and Denmark Street to the south of the site. The rear elevation would be 3 storey in appearance with accommodation also in the roof. It would be 9.6m high to eaves and 13.2m to ridge which would be 4.3m higher than 13 Goose Green and 2.2m higher than Grosvenor House. In comparison to the previously approved scheme it would be a similar height, although the previous scheme had a lower ridge to the right-hand side. From the bridge the building would obstruct existing views of buildings and the town centre currently evident through the site and which existed when the site was previously occupied by single storey buildings.
15. It is considered that the height of the proposed building relative to the adjacent buildings and Goose Green would result in a degree of harm to the character and appearance of both Conservation Areas. The character of Goose Green and this part of Back Grafton Street is of buildings modest in scale and there are no comparable buildings of both the width and height as that proposed. The NPPF identifies that significance can be harmed to the extent of 'substantial harm or total loss' (Paragraph 133) or 'less than substantial harm' (Paragraph 134). It is considered the level of harm to the significance of the Conservation Areas (the designated heritage asset) would be 'less than substantial' having regard to the NPPF, therefore paragraph 134 of the NPPF is relevant which requires the harm

to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

16. The agent has stated the scheme will lead to the following benefits: -

- The provision of 13 dwellings. The NPPF highlights the need to significantly bolster the supply of new housing.
- Redevelopment of a disused, derelict site, which is in a location inappropriate to accommodate its former industrial use.
- Delivery of a quality scheme, which will significantly enhance the character of Back Grafton Street, and the Goose Green Conservation Area.
- Encouraging activity in Altrincham Town Centre, leading to benefits for local businesses, and making Altrincham Town Centre safer through increased activity and passive surveillance.
- A CIL contribution of £46,605. The site /development is in a 'hot charging zone', does not qualify as an exception, and is not eligible for any relief, meaning the full amount will be payable.

17. In this case it is considered that the public benefits resulting from the development, in particular the redevelopment of a vacant, previously developed site in the town centre and which currently detracts from both Conservation Areas, would outweigh the less than substantial harm resulting from the height of the development. Whilst the height is a concern, the building is otherwise considered appropriate to its context (see paragraph below) and the difference in height to adjacent buildings and the scale of buildings in Goose Green generally is not considered so significant that it would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Areas or outweigh the public benefits resulting from the development.

Design and materials

18. In terms of design and appearance the building is traditional in form with contemporary elements. The originally submitted scheme included a part rendered front elevation which has since been amended to all brick as render was considered inappropriate having regard to the character of the immediate area. The front and rear elevations incorporate a vertical break achieved by half of each elevation being recessed by half a brick, (approximately 20mm) which assists in breaking up the massing of the building and ensures the elevations reflect the proportions of other buildings in the immediate vicinity. The fenestration, in terms of the positioning and size of windows is considered in keeping with the fenestration pattern of adjoining buildings and the windows would be white painted timber with red sandstone surrounds which is considered appropriate. The roofs would be pitched with natural slate covering in keeping with other roofs along Back Grafton Street and Goose Green. It is considered the appearance of the building in terms of its design and materials would be appropriate to its context and would have acceptable impact in the street scene and on the character and appearance of the Conservation Areas.

IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

19. Policy L7 requires development to be compatible with the surrounding area and not prejudice the amenity of future occupiers of the development and/or occupants of adjacent properties by reason of, amongst others, overbearing, overshadowing, overlooking, visual intrusion, noise and/or disturbance. Policy L2 also requires development to not be harmful to the amenity of the immediately surrounding area and in accordance with Policy L7. The Council's Guidelines for new residential development state where there would be major facing windows, three storey dwellings (houses or flats) should retain a minimum distance of 24m across public highways and 30 metres across private gardens. For four or more storeys the figures as for 3 storeys apply.

Impact on apartments to the rear

20. To the rear of the site are four storey apartments at Olivier House. The above window to window separation distances don't strictly apply to this development as the intervening land is used as a car park and isn't private garden or a highway, however they serve as a useful guide. A distance of approximately 21.2m would be retained between the rear elevation and facing windows in Olivier House which falls short of both the above guidelines and there would be potential overlooking between the development and Olivier House. It is considered however, that the separation distance is sufficient for the following reasons: 1) this is the same distance as the previous permission for a residential scheme that was 4 storey to the rear with a similar number of windows and which was found to be acceptable; 2) this is a town centre location where separation distances between buildings are generally lower than other locations given the higher density of development; and 3) any redevelopment on this site would be difficult to achieve and not make best use of a suitable brownfield site if a minimum distance of 24m or 30m from Olivier House was required.

Amenity for future occupants

21. The proposal would not provide any outdoor amenity space for the occupiers of the apartments, however it is considered that apartments in a town centre location such as this would not necessarily require amenity space. There are numerous instances in Altrincham and other town centres where apartments do not provide amenity space yet still provide an acceptable standard of accommodation for their occupiers. As the proposed apartments are all 1 bedroom they are also less likely to be occupied by families with a greater requirement for amenity space.

22. The Environmental Noise Assessment concludes façade element acoustic specifications are necessary to achieve adequate internal noise levels and an appropriate specification can be secured by condition.

CAR PARKING

23. The Council's parking standards set out in the Core Strategy require 0.5 to 1 space for 1 bedroom dwellings in the town centre. The proposed development does not provide any car parking and therefore fails to meet this standard. Although the proposal would not comply with the standard, it is acknowledged the site is within a highly sustainable location, within the town centre and within a short walk of Altrincham Interchange where comprehensive tram, train and bus services are available. The location is also within walking distance of places of work, shops, leisure uses and other amenities and is therefore suitable for residents who are not car owners. There is no on-street public parking within the immediate vicinity of the site and this section of Back Grafton Street, in addition to nearby Goose Green, is proposed to become a restricted parking zone later this year. It is considered unlikely that future residents of the development would own cars as they would need to park them some considerable distance away and they would not be eligible for permits for any of the town centre residents' parking schemes. Visitors with cars wishing to park close to the development would need to use public car parks or on-street parking facilities elsewhere in the town centre. Overall it is considered that the proposed development would not create significant levels of traffic or parking within the town centre, and the LHA therefore raises no objection to the proposals.

24. The Council's cycle standards for this location require 1 space per dwelling. A cycle store is included on the ground floor (12 spaces) which would have access via Back Grafton Street through the communal area. Cycle storage for the lower ground floor apartments would be provided on the lower ground floor (2 spaces). This level of provision satisfies the Council's standard and the arrangements are considered acceptable for the development.

REFUSE ARRANGEMENTS

25. The development incorporates a bin store within the building with access direct from Back Grafton Street. This would accommodate communal refuse and recyclable waste bins and avoids the need for bins to be stored externally or left on Back Grafton Street (other than on collection day).

CONTAMINATED LAND

26. The application site and the area have a history of industrial use and therefore the land may be contaminated. A Phase 1 Desktop Study Report has been prepared and submitted with the application. The report indicates the site can be considered as being located within a low-moderate geotechnical risk setting, low-moderate ground contamination risk setting for human health and low ground contamination risk setting for controlled waters. It recommends a Phase 2: Ground Investigation is completed for the site prior to commencement of

development to determine the ground conditions and if any contamination is present on site which may pose a risk to the end users or the environment. A condition to this effect is recommended should permission be granted.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

27. This proposal is subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and is located in the 'hot zone' for residential development, consequently private market apartments will be liable to a CIL charge rate of £65 per square metre, in line with Trafford's CIL charging schedule and revised SPD1: Planning Obligations (2014).
28. In accordance with Policy L8 of the Trafford Core Strategy and revised SPD1: Planning Obligations (2014) it is necessary to provide an element of specific green infrastructure. SPD1 sets out a requirement for 1 tree per apartment or the provision of alternative Green Infrastructure treatments in lieu of, or in combination with, tree provision such as native species hedge, green roof, green wall, etc. The footprint of the development is such that there is no opportunity for tree planting on site and the scope for Green Infrastructure is also limited given the nature of the building and its surroundings. In this case and having regard to the benefits referred to above it is considered the development would be acceptable without the provision of specific green infrastructure.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND VIABILITY

29. On 28th November 2014 the National Planning Policy Guidance was revised to introduce a national minimum threshold for when affordable housing could be sought for new residential development. More specifically, it states that contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floor-space of no more than 1,000 sq. m. Policy L2 of the Core Strategy states in respect of all qualifying development proposals, appropriate provision should be made to meet the identified need for affordable housing. The Altrincham area is identified as a "hot" market location where the affordable housing contribution set out in Policy L2 is 40%. This equates to a requirement for 5 of the 13 units to be affordable.
30. The applicant has submitted a viability appraisal which concludes the scheme is unable to deliver any affordable housing. The appraisal has taken into account a CIL liability (calculated by the developer as £46,605). The developer has referred to the predicted profit level of the scheme as being below what would normally be regarded as the minimum for what they have described as an 'intrinsically a risky investment', particularly when having regard to: the size of the investment required to deliver the scheme; the risks associated with the redevelopment of a constrained brownfield site within the recently extended Conservation Area; and the wider economic climate. The agent has advised the viability of the scheme becomes even more marginal following the amendments made to the scheme, which have resulted in the loss of one apartment.

31. The updated appraisal is currently being assessed by the Council's Asset Management Section and this will be included in the Additional Information Report prior to the meeting. Until such time as the viability appraisal is accepted and there is agreement no affordable housing can be provided within the scheme, the requirement to provide 5 affordable units still applies and a legal agreement would be necessary to secure this.


RECOMMENDATION: MINDED TO GRANT SUBJECT TO LEGAL AGREEMENT and subject to the following conditions:

- (A) That the application will propose a satisfactory form of development for the site upon completion of an appropriate legal agreement to secure an appropriate level of affordable housing (5 units) on the site; and
- (B) In the circumstances where the S106 Agreement has not been completed within three months of the resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Head of Planning Services; and
- (C) That upon satisfactory completion of the above legal agreement, planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions: -
 - 1. Standard 3 year time limit
 - 2. Amended plans
 - 3. Samples of materials to be submitted and approved, including red brick, natural slate, timber cladding, timber windows, metal rainwater goods
 - 4. Conservation rooflights
 - 5. Phase 2: Ground Investigation to be carried out prior to commencement of development
 - 6. Drainage scheme / SUDs
 - 7. Noise mitigation measures
 - 8. Secure cycle parking to be provided as per plans

RG



Land between Grosvenor House & 11A Goose Green, Back Grafton Street, Altrincham (site hatched on plan)



Scale: 1:1,250

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright 2012.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Organisation	Trafford Council
Department	Planning Service
Comments	Committee date 9/07/2015
Date	29/06/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

WARD: Village

85049/FUL/15

DEPARTURE: No

Formation of 20x no. new car-parking spaces with new vehicular accesses for occupants of 1-20 The Green, Whitley Gardens. Associated landscaping works including new pedestrian pathways throughout and relocation of pedestrian gate.

1-20 The Green, Whitley Gardens, Timperley, WA15 6XE

APPLICANT: Trafford Housing Trust

AGENT: BTP Architects

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

SITE

The application site comprises three detached blocks of single storey accommodation. Block 1 includes Nos. 1-6 The Green; Block 2 includes 7-12 The Green and Block 3 includes 13-20 The Green. The accommodation blocks are located in two unconventional plots which are essentially two island sites with a road surrounding the sites on all four sides (Whitley Gardens to the north and south sides with Whitley Place dissecting both island sites). Grange Avenue is located to the north-west side of the site and Fairywell Road to the south east.

Block 1 and 2 are located within the same island site nearest the junction with Grange Avenue an electricity sub-station is also located within this part of the site. Block 3 is located close to the junction with Fairywell Road.

Both areas of the site are secured by low level railings and the blocks of accommodation are set within communal areas of grassed amenity space. A number of trees are located around the perimeter of the site.

The site is surrounded on all sides by semi-detached two storey residential dwellings.

The site is unallocated within the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan proposals map

PROPOSAL

The application proposes the formation of 20 No. car-parking spaces, five of which are for disabled parking provision. The spaces will be for the use of the residents within 1-20 The Green, works will also include new vehicular accesses to the car-parking and associated landscaping works.

Four separate areas of new parking are proposed as follows:-

Car Park Nos. 1 & 2 – These two areas of car-parking will be located between Block 1 and Block 2. Both areas of car-parking will have six spaces in total, two of which will be for disabled parking. Both areas of car parking will have a new vehicular access, one located on the north side of the site onto Whitley Gardens and one on the south side again onto Whitley Gardens. It is proposed to use porous asphalt to the surface of the parking areas. Appropriate pedestrian footpath within the application site will be provided around the new parking to ensure suitable access for the residents. A number of items of street furniture will require relocating to facilitate the new vehicular access on the north side; this has been identified on the submitted plans. (Telegraph pole and BT box)

Car Park No.3 – This particular car-park is located on the south east side of Block 3 and will provide four car parking spaces, two of which will be for disabled parking. Again porous asphalt to be used on the surface with a new pedestrian pathway provided within the site for ease of access by residents. The new vehicular access will be on the south side. A tree is proposed to be removed to facilitate the new area of parking.

Car Park No.4 – Is located to the north west side of Block 3 and will provide four parking spaces, one of which will be for disabled parking. The new vehicular access will be onto the north side of the site to Whitley Gardens. Porous asphalt to be used on the surface with a new pedestrian pathway; an existing pedestrian gate to be relocated to the new pathway.

All pedestrian pathways to be asphalt concrete paving.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**, adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 1st April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2013 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L4 – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

L7 – Design

L8 – Planning Obligations

R2 – Natural Environment

R3 – Green Infrastructure

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

None

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

None

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has submitted a Design and Access statement in support of the application which will be referred to as necessary within this report.

CONSULTATIONS

Local Highway Authority (LHA) - The visibility from car park four is limited because of its proximity to the hairpin bend at the end of the road, but vehicles speeds will be generally low in this location therefore it is not considered a highway safety risk. The LHA therefore has no objection to the proposals which will significantly improve residents parking provision in this location. Any alteration to the adopted highway required when forming the new accesses should be discussed with Trafford Council Highway Services prior to any work commencing.

Electricity North West (ENW) – No objections, general comments for applicant to contact ENW in advance of works commencing in proximity to ENW infrastructure.

Drainage - It will be necessary to constrain the peak discharge rate of storm water from this development. Condition required for submission of scheme in compliance with Trafford Council Level 2 Hybrid SFRA.

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbours – Six letters of objection received, citing the following concerns:-

- Disturbance from parking of cars close to the buildings (noise, loss of privacy)
- Road narrows in sections, if cars parked on pavement opposite new accesses it would be difficult to negotiate turn into the new parking areas. Could cause damage to cars parked on the highway.
- Visibility to (car park 4) would be obscured because it is located after the bend in the road.
- Parking spaces for some disabled residents could be located closer to the building
- No consultation from Trafford Housing Trust with residents
- Paths need to be made wider to be Disability Discrimination Act compliant
- No external lighting to parking area, residents could trip at night going to their property from the car-park.
- Concern that parking spaces will be used by non-residents
- There could be security issues and an increase in anti-social behaviour.

Two further letters have been received, one supporting the proposal and one requesting that the road is widened at Grange Avenue in front of Nos.7-17 Grange Avenue.

OBSERVATIONS

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

1. A number of residents within The Green have raised concerns over general activity such as comings and goings from the new parking areas and in particular vehicular noise. The buildings within The Green are effectively attached bungalows with main habitable windows facing the proposed parking areas. The positioning of the parking spaces is reflective of how cars would be parked in proximity to a residential property. Car parks 1 & 2 are located between Block 1 and 2, and they have been positioned closer to the roadside rather than centrally between both blocks. An area of grassed amenity space is still to be retained between both blocks
2. The number of spaces to each car-park is low, whilst residents will be aware of cars using the car-park it is not considered to be the detriment of residential amenity. The site is surrounded by on-street car parking and so currently there is a general level of parking/manoeuvring activity within close proximity to the properties.
3. Loss of privacy has also been raised as a concern with people looking into properties from the car-park. Currently there are pathways around the building which residents can freely move around as the sites are open plan with communal access. The level of general comings and goings from the spaces

would be considered to be low; these spaces are for resident's only and not general public use. Single storey accommodation on such a communal site will by its nature afford views into properties by passing pedestrians. The car parks would not result in a loss of privacy considered to be detrimental to the amenity of occupants.

CARPARKING AND ACCESS

4. Currently no parking provision exists for the residents of 1-20 The Green, the proposal will provide much sought after off-street parking. The majority of two storey semi-detached dwellings surrounding the site have off-street parking provision ranging between 1 and 2 spaces.
5. Residents of The Green have no option currently but to park on street. This proposal will remove this on street parking which will be a benefit to other residents along Whitley Gardens. Whilst this will not completely remove all on street parking in the immediate area, it will help alleviate it. The road surrounding the application site (Whitley Gardens) is narrow and any car parking on street can cause an obstruction and difficulty for motorists manoeuvring past. A number of residents have raised concern regarding difficulties in cars accessing the car-parks. The LHA have raised no objections to the accessibility of the new vehicular accesses. Visibility to car-park No.4 was identified as being limited, but the LHA have assessed the speed of approaching cars from the bend as being low. Boundary treatment along this section of the site near to the entrance of car-park No. 4 consists of low level railings which do not act as a visual barrier for approaching traffic or pedestrians. In order to retain this open aspect a condition will be attached preventing any solid boundary treatment or planting in that vicinity.

TREES AND LANDSCAPING

6. One tree is proposed to be removed to facilitate car-park No.3, the loss of this tree is not considered to have any detrimental impact on the streetscene. Sufficient capacity exists within the site to provide some replacement tree planting and general soft landscaping improvements. This is considered appropriate given the new hard surfaced areas of car parking being provided. An appropriate landscaping condition to be included.

DRAINAGE

7. The proposal includes provision of porous asphalt on the car-parking surfaces. It is considered that such provision within the scheme is a positive contribution to reducing storm water surface water from the site. No further details required relating to drainage as details on submitted plans relating to porous materials to be controlled through materials on approved plans condition. An appropriate

condition to be attached to ensure the car park is surfaced with the porous asphalt as per the details on the submitted plans

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

8. No planning obligations are required as a result of this development.

CONCLUSION

9. The proposed areas of car-parking are considered to be a positive development that will provide convenient parking provision for the mainly elderly and disabled occupants of 1-20 The Green.


RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard
2. Approved Plans
3. Materials in accordance with approved plans
4. Landscaping
5. Visibility splay to car-park no.4 to be kept clear of planting
6. Car parking areas to be surfaced with porous asphalt in accordance with the approved plans.

CM



1-20 The Green, Whitley Gardens, Timperley (site hatched on plan)



Scale: 1:2,500

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright 2012.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Organisation	Trafford Council
Department	Planning Service
Comments	Committee date 9/07/2015
Date	29/06/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

WARD: Hale Central

85149/FUL/15

DEPARTURE: NO

Erection of a 2 storey detached dwelling with attached garage, following demolition of existing. Landscaping works throughout.

7 Riddings Road, Hale, WA15 9DS

APPLICANT: Mr Kirk

AGENT: Calder Peel Partnership

RECOMMENDATION: MINDED TO GRANT

Councillor Mitchell has requested that this application be determined by the Planning Development Control Committee for reasons set out within the report

SITE

The application relates to a two storey detached dwelling, sited on the northern side of Riddings road, Hale; situated within a large residential area, the application dwelling has other residential properties sited to all sides. The main dwelling itself remains centrally sited within a reasonably sized plot and is largely built at two storey level with a single storey addition sited to the rear; there also lies a single, detached garage to the eastern side of the site. The main dwelling has a hipped roof design and has landscaped gardens to its rear and western sides.

The site remains situated within Sub Area B of the South Hale Conservation Area.

PROPOSAL

The application details the erection of a two storey detached dwelling with an attached garage, following demolition of the existing dwelling on site; with landscaping works through-out.

The application has been amended since the original submission, following concerns raised by the LPA which is further discussed within the Observations section of this report.

The increase in floor space of the proposed development would be 91m².
The total floorspace of the proposed development would be 264 m².
The total floorspace of the proposed new dwelling would be 173 m².

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The Trafford Core Strategy, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.
- The Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan, adopted 1st April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan, adopted 26th April 2013 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L7 – Design

L4 – Sustainable transport and accessibility

R1 – Historic environments

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

ENV21 – Conservation Areas

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

78833/HHA/2012 - Erection of a two storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation – Allowed at Appeal – 13/01/2013.

77766/HHA/2011 – Erection of a single storey extension to front and rear of dwelling, upgrade and rendering of existing garage and erection of front boundary chain link fence and associated landscaping - Approved with conditions 10/01/2012.

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

Heritage statement
Bat Survey

CONSULTATIONS

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit:

A bat assessment was provided by a suitably qualified bat worker for the building proposed for demolition. This found no evidence of bats and assessed the building as having negligible risk owing to the high levels of maintenance, which eliminated any access opportunities for bats. I am satisfied with the findings of the assessment: please apply for following informative to any permission:

“Whilst the building has been assessed as of negligible risk for bats, the applicant is reminded that under the Habitat Regulation it is an offence to disturb, harm or kill bats. If a bat is found during the demolition all work should cease immediately and a suitably licensed bat worker employed to assess how best to safeguard the Bat(s). Natural England should be informed”.

Drainage:

It will be necessary to contain the peak discharge rate of storm water from this development, in accordance with the limits indicated in the Guidance Document to the Manchester City, Salford City and Trafford Councils level 2 Hybrid Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Recommend the use of the following condition:

“No development shall be required shall be commenced unless and until full details of the proposals to meet the requirements of the Guidance have been submitted to an approved by the Local Planning Authority and none of the development shall be brought into use until such details as approved are implemented in full. Such works to be retained and maintained thereafter”.

REPRESENTATIONS

Original submission

Councillor Mitchel called in the application due to raising the following concerns:

- The projection, scale, height and massing of the proposed dwelling would lead to loss of light, visual intrusion and overbearing concerns for neighbouring properties

Neighbours - 3 objections were received on the following grounds:

- Proposed development would have overbearing related concerns
- Loss of light concerns
- Visual intrusion
- Materials out of keeping with other properties on Riddings Road

- Overlooking concerns from proposed openings
- Harm to Conservation Area through demolition of existing dwelling
- Design out of keeping with surrounding street scene

Revised scheme

Councillor Mitchel has again expressed a call in based on the above concerns:

- The projection, scale, height and massing of the proposed dwelling would lead to loss of light, visual intrusion and overbearing concerns for neighbouring properties

Neighbours - 1 objection raised the following concerns:

- Proposal would lead to overbearing and loss of light concerns for neighbouring properties

OBSERVATIONS

1. The original scheme detailed the proposed new dwelling to have a greater footprint and also detailed a different arrangement for the proposed window openings. The proposal thus remained contrary policies L7 and R1 from the TBC Core strategy as well as the Councils locally adopted South Hale Conservation Area Guidelines. Following feedback from the LPA the application scheme was amended to remove the amenity and spaciousness related concerns raised.
2. The application site lies within sub-area B of the South Hale Conservation Area which is characterised by residential properties of a relatively low density. The majority of the properties are Victorian or Edwardian and the remainder being inter-war or modern in-filling, some in the form of three storey flats. Many of the properties are set back from the road with long front gardens and set in large grounds of semi-mature/mature landscaping. The frontages are mainly low stone walls with evergreen hedgerow over and trees behind.

Principal of development:

3. The application details the demolition of an existing property sited on the northern side of Riddings Road, to allow for a new build, two storey detached dwelling, with some living space at second floor level. The existing dwelling has been in poor condition for a number of years and remains in need of repair and refurbishment. The property itself is currently considered as making a slightly positive contribution to the wider South Hale Conservation Area, based upon its siting and retention of spaciousness within the site and less so upon its design, which holds little or no architectural or historical merit. Its contribution thus largely relates to the dwelling achieving a reasonable set-back from the front

boundary of the site and regular size breaks from its side boundaries, in line with the South Hale Conservation Area guidelines and the surrounding street scene.

4. The proposed dwelling would again largely be built at two storey level and would also work to retain the existing set back achieved from the front boundary of the site. It would use much of the existing properties foot-print and the design also works to incorporate key characteristic features of properties within the area, by incorporating features such as; chimney stacks, window bays and gabled ends which feature along many of the neighbouring properties and of others within the Conservation Area. The proposal is thus considered to be of a higher overall quality, both in its design and style and is thus considered as making a greater contribution to the wider Conservation Area. It is therefore considered that given the current state of the property on the application site and the overall design and quality of that proposed, its demolition and replacement be considered acceptable.

Design

5. The proposed dwelling has been designed to feature a hipped roof design, achieving the same overall ridge height as the existing property on site, of 8.8 metres; the eaves height also remains the same as the existing at 5.8 metres. The proposed dwelling itself has its front elevation evenly broken up by having a central front porch feature within the main two storey elevation and bay windows within. The central section of the dwelling would be built at two storey level, with a single storey section to its western side and a further single storey garage sited to its east. The single storey additions would be set back from the main front elevation and therefore would remain secondary. The elevation has been evenly broken up through the use of large widow openings, stone detailing and red brick. The materials thus remain in keeping with the wider area and are thus considered acceptable. A small dormer is sited within the front elevation at two storey level, this achieves a ridge height equal to the front gabled end and achieves a visual break from the eaves and the main ridge height. The openings and dormer all remain proportionally sized and remain in-line, in terms of their overall design and style.
6. The side elevations have also been well designed with forward projecting two and single storey projections, which allow the elevations to be broken up. The same design has been carried through for the openings and the single storey elements are considered to add interest to the overall character and style of the property. A chimney has further been added above the single storey side addition to the western side of the dwelling, this acts as a prominent feature within the dwellings design itself and wider street scene, adding a sense of style and character.
7. To the rear and eastern side of the site a small glazed conservatory-like structure has been designed. This remains screened from the front elevation and would

not be visible from any clear public vantage point. The glazed section would have a low overall ridge height and would remain secondary to the main house and is thus considered acceptable.

8. The property's overall design therefore remains contemporary with traditional features which are characteristic of properties within the area. The interesting roof lines and proportionately sized openings add detail to the dwelling. The design alongside the use of matching materials to other properties within the area are thus considered to positively contribute to both the character, design and setting of the wider South Hale Conservation Area, in line with the South Hale Conservation Area guidelines and policy L7 and R1 of the TBC Core strategy.

Spaciousness

9. In order to preserve the special character of space within the South Hale Conservation Area, the Conservation Area guidelines set out parameters for the building envelope. For Sub-area B the SPG recommends that a total distance of 16m metres should be retained to both side boundaries where the building is two storeys and not less than 3m should be retained on any one side. Distances of 15m to the front boundary and 20m to the rear boundary should normally be retained.

Parameters (Sub Area B)	Guideline Figure	Existing	Meets Guideline ?	Proposed	Meets Guideline ?
Distance from front boundary	15m	8m	N	8m	N
Distance to side boundaries of site (total both sides)	16m	12m	N	10.8m	N
Which on any one side must not be less than this figure	3m	4.6m to western side and 0.2 metres to eastern side	Y	3.7m to western side and 0.8 metres to eastern side	Y
Minimum distance to rear boundary	20m	8.5m at closest point	N	8.5 at closest point	N
Number of floors	2	2	Y	2	Y
Roofspace which may be used as additional floor space in the	Half	0	Y	0.5	Y

case of 2 storey development)					
Hard Area Parameter (Site of 0.18ha)	26%	19%	Y	27.8%	N

10. As detailed within the above table, both the existing and the proposed dwelling would retain 8m to the front boundary of the site and 8.5 metres to the rear, which remains short of the South Hale Conservation Area guidelines. The guidelines however state that where a property does not meet the detailed distances, the situation on site should not be made any worse through future development. In this instance the distances to the front and the rear boundaries of the dwelling would not be increased as part of the proposal and therefore would not be made any worse and are thus considered acceptable.
11. With regards to the distances retained to the side boundaries of the site. The proposed dwelling would be stepping closer to both the eastern and western side boundaries of the site when compared to the existing dwelling, at both single and two storey level. The existing dwelling retains a total combined distance of 12 metres at its closest point, at two storey level to the two side boundaries. This distance would be decreased to 10.8 metres at its closest point within the proposed and therefore result in a total reduction of 1.2 metres. The guidelines further detail that any one side elevation should retain at least 3 metres to each side boundary. Both the existing and proposed dwellings would comply with this guideline when referenced with the western side boundary and both would fail to meet this on the eastern side of the site. However, within the current proposal the space to the eastern side boundary of the site would be increased by 0.6 metres to 0.8 metres overall compared to 0.2 metres currently being retained to the side boundary from the detached garage; improving the current situation on site.
12. Therefore the overall situation would reduce slightly at two storey level but improve to the eastern side of the site at single storey level. In this instance it should also be noted that any loss of space within the proposed scheme would be compensated for by the improved overall design of the proposed dwelling which would have a much greater and more positive contribution to the South Hale Conservation Area and therefore would outweigh any small reduction with regards to space retained to the side boundaries at two storey level. Therefore the current proposal is considered acceptable and the small decrease is not considered to materially detract from the spacious nature of the site and wider street scene. Furthermore any approval decision for the current scheme would be accompanied with the removal of the General Permitted Developments Rights of a residential dwelling which would not allow the dwelling to extend out any

further to the rear or sides, which would further ensure the conservation of the space within the site itself and wider street scene.

13. The guidelines also recommend that no more than approximately 26% of a site of this size (0.18ha) should be covered by buildings and by hard surfacing for parking and manoeuvring space (the guidelines state that driveways to the front of the building and garden paths are not counted as hard area for this purpose). The existing hard standing of the property inclusive of the existing dwelling house and detached garage is calculated as being approximately 19%. This calculation would be increased to 27.8% under the current proposal. Although this remains 1.8% over the recommended hard area coverage figure detailed within the guidelines, due to the improved overall design and style of the proposed dwelling being improved from the current situation on site its contribution to the Conservation Area is still deemed to be improved and increased and would thus outweigh this small loss in soft area coverage.
14. The existing property is located upon a relatively small plot compared to others within Sub area B of the South Hale Conservation Area. Its main character is derived from its positioning within the plot. With relation to the development guidelines, the current property complies with the amount of hard standing as a percentage of the site and this would not be materially increased as part of the proposal as detailed above. The location of landscaping would also remain unaltered.

Residential amenity

15. As noted above the proposed new dwelling would largely be retaining the footprint of the existing and would thus be coming no closer to the front boundary of the site than the existing. The Councils Householder extension guidelines detail a minimum distance of 21 metres to be retained between habitable main rooms of opposite facing properties, which the current scheme would exceed by around 10 metres, thus the openings sited within the main front elevation across the three levels are not considered to pose any new material overlooking related concerns.
16. The existing dwelling has main habitable room openings within its eastern side facing elevation at first floor level, which allows for overlooking into the side/rear garden area of number 9 Riddings Road. The current proposal would remove this and have only obscure glazed openings relating to non-habitable rooms and a secondary bedroom opening sited within this elevation, which are thus considered acceptable and would also be an improvement from the existing situation on site. The openings would retain a distance of 3 – 4 metres from the eastern side boundary at all times, due to the tapering nature of this boundary. This is currently formed from 1.8 metre fencing and thus the proposed openings at ground floor level are again considered to pose minimal overlooking related concerns.

17. To the western side, the boundary again remains formed by 1.8 metre fencing and the ground floor openings would be sited between 8 and 9 metres from this boundary and are thus again considered to pose no material overlooking related concerns for number 5 Riddings Road. The opening at first floor level within this elevation would again be obscure glazed to limit any overlooking potential.
18. At ground floor level, the openings sited within the rear elevation of the dwelling would retain between 8.5 and 9 metres to the rear tapering boundary of the site. This too is currently formed from 1.8 metre fencing as well as mature planting of around 6 – 12 metres in height, some of which is ever-green. The openings proposed at ground floor level are thus considered not to pose any material overlooking potential for the rear side neighbouring properties.
19. The Council's Householder extension guidelines detail a distance of at least 10.5 metres to be retained to rear boundaries, in order to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties. In this case the proposal would be 2 metres short of this, as the first floor bedroom window would retain a distance of 8.5 metres to the rear boundary at its closest point. However, the existing property has an extant planning permission, allowed at appeal (78833/HHA/2013) for a first floor extension with a rear facing bedroom window sited within the same location as that proposed under the current scheme, this would also be retaining the same distance from the rear boundary. Although this was refused by the LPA it was allowed at appeal by the Planning Inspector. The assessment included a consideration of the large sized private garden areas of properties sited on Harrop Road and the substantial landscaping which lies between the two properties, part of which is ever-green and some of the planted trees are also protected by a Tree Preservation Order. This extant permission is a material consideration within the assessment of the current application; taking this decision and the overall distances between the two properties themselves into account which is in excess of 21 metres into account, this shortfall is considered to be acceptable in this instance.
20. The proposed new dwelling is not considered to pose material overbearing related concerns for the properties sited to the rear (north) and front (south) side of the site, given the substantial sized separation distances involved, which remain in excess of 30 metres.
21. With regards to number 5 Riddings Road, the proposed dwelling would not be increasing in its overall maximum height or its eaves height from the current situation on site. The proposed dwelling would however be moving closer to the western side boundary by 0.6 metres at two storey level. The separation distances between the two properties remain at between 14 and 15 metres, given the tapering nature of the boundary. Number 5 has ground floor window openings within its eastern side elevation relating to a main habitable room, this room also has further outlook to the rear, being a through-room. The Council's guidelines detail a 15m separation distance to be retained between a two storey

flank wall and a main habitable room opening within a neighbour's main elevation. In this instance the openings are sited within a side elevation and these openings do not form the only source of light/outlook into the room to which they relate, therefore in this instance taking this and the proposed distances between the two properties into account the proposed dwelling is considered not to pose any material overbearing related concerns for this property.

22. With regards to number 9 Riddings Road to the east of the dwelling, number 9 also has main habitable room openings within its western side elevation. These openings would retain a distance of 12 metres to the main bulk of the proposed two storey dwelling, dropping to 11 metres to a small forward projecting section within the rear most end of the proposed new dwellings eastern side elevation. As stated above, an extant permission for the existing dwelling to erect a first floor extension currently remains in place and thus would still act as material consideration within this application. The approved extension would retain a distance of 13 metres from number 9's side facing openings. This was allowed at appeal as the Inspector concluded that although the extension would lead to some impact on outlook from these openings and the amount of sun light they would receive at certain times of the year, as number 7 remains angled away from number 9 and given the separation distance involved, the extension would not lead to significant harm to justify refusal of the scheme. The Inspector further noted that any harm would be compensated for by the improved privacy relationship between the two properties, as an existing main opening was to be removed.
23. In this instance, the projection to the rear would remain the same as that allowed at appeal, albeit the roof design would be different with the approval being for a gabled end and the current design being a hip. The proposed hipped roof would be 1 metre higher at its height point when compared the approved gabled roof design, however this has a steep drop and thus would fall sharply towards the rear of the property, coming down to the eaves level of the proposed dwelling at 5.8 metres. Taking this and the separation distance of 12 metres into account, it is considered that although the dwelling would be coming closer to the boundary the improved overall relationship between the two properties, in terms of overlooking and the improved roof design and that of the eastern side elevation generally that the proposed dwelling would lead to some loss of light and outlook however this would not be to such a level to justify the refusal of this scheme. It is noted that at a small section of the dwelling the distance between the properties would drop further to 11 metres, however this section relates to an en-suite bathroom and has a much lower ridge height and width compared to the main bulk of the dwelling and would therefore not exacerbate the situation.
24. It should be further noted that the 15m guidelines relates to main elevations and as these openings relate to a side facing elevation which could have outlook to the rear and in this case does have a smaller opening to the rear, these openings should not be therefore awarded the same level of protection as those within a

main front or rear facing elevation. The proposal would only be marginally worse than that allowed at appeal and therefore is considered to be acceptable.

Trees

25. The proposal does not detail the removal of any of the existing trees on site, a further landscaping and tree protection scheme will be conditioned alongside any planning permission in order to protect those on site.

Parking

26. The proposed dwelling would feature an attached garage, alongside a driveway which would be able to accommodate 3- 4 vehicles. The proposal thus exceeds the 3 parking space requirement for a 4 bedroom property within this area detailed within policy L4 of the TBC Core strategy.


RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard
2. Submission of materials
3. Details – compliance with plans
4. Obscure glazing within side elevations at first floor level
5. Removal of PD to insert window openings at first floor level
6. Tree protection scheme
7. Landscaping scheme
8. Submission of porous materials
9. Removal of PD to convert garage
10. Removal of General Householder Permitted Development Rights

IG



7 Riddings Road, Hale (site hatched on plan)



Scale: 1:1,250

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright 2012.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Organisation	Trafford Council
Department	Planning Service
Comments	Committee date 9/07/2015
Date	29/06/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

WARD: St Marys

85167/FUL/15

DEPARTURE: No

Erection of a three storey extension to existing four storey building to create 3no. additional one bedroom apartments with associated new vehicular access to Washway Road, car parking and cycle storage.

226 Washway Road, Sale, M33 4RA

APPLICANT: LGK Group Ltd

AGENT: Randle White Architects

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

The application has been called in by Councillor Chilton for the reasons set out in the 'Representations' section of this report.

SITE

The existing property is semi-detached and contains four residential apartments. The property is three storeys with accommodation in the basement and loft. The building is set back from Washway Road with attractive lawn and gardens to the front and side. The property features attractive corbels at roof level and a traditional fenestration pattern. Presently hard standing for car parking is located to the rear of the site and accessed from Harboro Road.

PROPOSAL

It is proposed to erect a three storey extension to the existing four storey building to create 3no. additional one bedroom apartments with associated new access to Washway Road, car parking and cycle storage.

The increase in floor space of the proposed development would be 152 m².

Amended plans have been received since initial submission. These include a revised proposed site plan to address comments received from the Local Highways Authority in terms of the length of dropped kerb proposed and also revised elevation and plan drawings following changes to the design, height and appearance of the proposed extension and associated hard surfacing.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy** adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**, adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 1st April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2013 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L1 – Land for New Homes

L2 – Meeting Housing Needs

L4 – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

L7 – Design

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

None

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

None

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

Design and Access Statement

Planning and Housing Statement

CONSULTATIONS

LHA – No objection in principle

REPRESENTATIONS

One letter of support was received from a neighbouring property.

Two letters of objections have been received from neighbouring properties, No. 222 and 230 Washway Road.

The issues raised are summarised as below:

- Further traffic exiting onto Washway Road from the site close to the junction would result in a traffic safety issue which would be dangerous.
- The vehicle exit onto Washway Road from the site could result in a major safety hazard for the high number of schoolchildren who frequent the footpath early morning and late afternoon. Children cross not only at the crossing but other parts of the road and the introduction of the proposed exit/entrance to Washway road would be a 'recipe for disaster' in terms of pedestrian safety.
- The increased traffic as result of the proposal would result in additional exhaust fumes from stationary and slow moving vehicles compounding the serious issues relating to safety, air quality and congestion.
- Proposal would be overdevelopment
- The submitted plans fail to include the front door of 230 Washway Road and it is considered the proposal would result in an extensive car park being located just 2m away from No. 230. This would be detrimental and aesthetically unacceptable.
- The Council has a responsibility under the Human Rights Act and this states a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions which includes homes and land. The protection of countryside also falls within the interests of the Act and therefore private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings.
- Siting car parking in front of this 1871 Victorian building would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and villa style properties along the A56 should be preserved.
- The proposal will result in further refuse bins and these would all be left for collection at the existing Harboro Road entrance to the rear, as existing. This would result in further obstruction to the entrance of 230 Washway Road at the rear and also the public footpath on Harboro Road where school children frequent.

A request to call in the application was received from Cllr. Chilton. This outlined concerns including:

- the proposal represents overdevelopment of the site
- the proposal represents visual and residential disamenity
- Inadequate access arrangements resulting in danger to pedestrians and motorists, including the potential occupants of the property

Since receipt of amended plans, received by the Council on 22nd June 2015, a re-consultation has been undertaken enabling all neighbouring properties the opportunity to comment on the amended scheme. Any representations received as a result of this re-consultation will be reported in the Additional Information Report.

OBSERVATIONS

Principle of Development

- 1) Policy L1 of the Core Strategy, which relates to Land for New Homes, sets an indicative 80% target proportion of new housing provision to use brownfield land and buildings over the Plan period. Policy L2 of the Core Strategy, which is entitled “Meeting Housing Needs”, states that all new residential development proposals will be assessed for the contribution that will be made to meeting the housing needs of the Borough and the wider aspirations of the Council’s Sustainable Community Strategy. It requires new development to be:
 - (a) On a site of sufficient size to accommodate adequately the proposed use and all necessary ancillary facilities for prospective residents;
 - (b) Appropriately located in terms of access to existing community facilities and/or delivers complementary improvements to the social infrastructure (schools, health facilities, and leisure and retail facilities) to ensure the sustainability of the development;
 - (c) Not harmful to the character or amenity of the immediately surrounding area and;
 - (d) To be in accordance with L7 and other relevant policies within the Development Plan for Trafford.
- 2) The application site is considered to be located within an accessible location being sited within walking distance to Sale Town Centre which provides access to a number of bus routes and the metrolink.
- 3) The proposal is to provide three one bedroom residential apartments. In terms of the housing mix, CS Policy L2.7 states that 1 bedroom, general needs accommodation will normally only be acceptable for schemes that support the regeneration of Trafford’s town centres and the Regional Centre. It goes on to state that in all circumstances, the delivery of such accommodation will need to be specifically justified in terms of a clearly identified need.
- 4) The applicant has submitted letters from local estate agents in Appendix 2 of the submitted Housing and Planning Statement that confirm there is a demand for 1 bedroom accommodation in the area. In light of this evidence, the current use of the site and the location close to Sale Town Centre area, the provision of 1 bedroom accommodation is considered acceptable in this case.
- 5) The development would also be located on garden/greenfield land. Consequently, the proposal is to be considered in light of Policies L1.7- L1.10 of

the Trafford Core Strategy. In particular, Policy L1.7 sets an indicative target of 80% of new housing provision to be built on brownfield land. In order to achieve this, the Council will release previously developed land and sustainable urban area green-field land in the following order of priority:

- Firstly land within the Regional Centre and Inner Areas;
 - Secondly, land that can be shown to contribute significantly to the achievement of the regeneration priorities set out in Policy L3 and/or strengthen and support Trafford's 4 town centres; and
 - Thirdly land that can be shown to be of benefit to the achievement of the wider plan objectives set out in Chapters 4 and 5 of the Core Strategy. (Strategic Objectives and Place Objectives).
- 6) As the site does not sit within either the Regional Centre or Inner Area, the proposal would be considered against the second and third points of Policy L1.7.
- 7) The applicants have addressed Policy L1.7 in the submitted Housing and Planning Statement. Given the sustainable location and proximity to Sale Town Centre the principle of additional residential accommodation on this site is considered acceptable, and the proposal would not prejudice the Council's ability to meet the brownfield land development target outlined in the Core Strategy.

Design and Visual Amenity

- 8) The existing property is semi-detached and contains four residential apartments. The property is three storeys with accommodation in the basement and loft. The building is set back from Washway Road with attractive lawn and gardens to the front and side. The property features attractive corbels at roof level and a traditional fenestration pattern. Presently hard standing for car parking is located to the rear of the site and accessed from Harboro Road.
- 9) The existing property when viewed from the front has the appearance of an extension to the attached property, Number 230 Washway Road. It is set back from the front elevation of No. 230 and is positioned lower at roof level, with the attractive corbels extending across both attached No. 230 and the subject property 226-228 Washway Road. Visually the property appears subordinate to the attached No. 230 Washway Road and together the pair displays a positive attractive character on a prominent corner location. The character and appearance of the pair is enhanced by the existing degree of spaciousness displayed at the site. This spaciousness with vegetation and greenery between and around the buildings is a feature of many of the properties in the immediate vicinity, particularly those to the north of the site.
- 10) The proposed extension would be located to the north eastern side of the property and would be set back from the front elevation by approximately 300m. The extension would be positioned 3061mm from the boundary with No. 224

Washway Road and would be no higher than the eaves of the existing property. While the Council's SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (2012) is predominantly in relation to proposals to single family dwelling houses, the guidance it contains is relevant to development such as that proposed. It states *'the gaps in between buildings and the space surrounding them make an important contribution to an area's character. An extension that appears too large in the street scene reduces this sense of spaciousness and can harm the character of the area. It is important that sufficient space is retained within a plot to ensure that the site does not appear cramped or over-developed and to ensure that the street scene retains its prevailing residential pattern.'*

11) It is considered the proposed extension would be subordinate to the main building, being set back from the front elevation and retaining sufficient distance to the boundary with No. 224 Washway Road. The proposed fenestration and brick detailing would complement the existing at the property and the roof would have the same pitch as the main roof at the property with the attractive eaves detailing replicated to match the existing. The proposed extension has been revised since initial submission and while the height of the extension has increased since initial submission, it is considered the detailed design of the revised proposal would result in an extension that compliments the character and appearance of the building and would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area, compliant with CS Policy L7.

12) The proposal would result in the loss of some of the existing front grassed area. This element of the proposal has also been amended since initial submission with landscaping retained particularly in front of the existing building and on the boundary with No. 230 Washway Road. The hard standing proposed at the front of the building would accommodate the necessary car parking facilities for the additional residential accommodation together with the retention of car parking at the rear of the site. The property and its setting is green and open in character with the property set back and landscaping in front and to the side. This proposal ensures the green character of the site would be retained while also accommodating necessary car parking. The properties within the vicinity of the site tend to retain green and landscaped frontages and that proposed would be similar to the frontages exhibited at properties immediately north of the site on Washway Road (No's 214 to 224). Therefore, in light of the provision of additional housing and the extension being set back and in keeping with the character of the building and subject to a landscaping condition, this aspect of the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

Residential Amenity

13) The extension as proposed would be located in the north eastern side of the site adjacent to the boundary with the immediate neighbour, 224 Washway Road. In terms of the impact the proposal would have on the neighbouring property No. 224 Washway Road, the extension would be sited 3061mm from the boundary

with this property. In terms of side extensions this meets the requirement as set out in SPD4: *A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (2012)* and that proposed provides the same amount of space to the side boundary as the neighbouring property. The proposed roof would be set down 400mm from the existing roof line of the building and the rear elevation of the extension would be set back 500mm from the main rear elevation of the building. The side elevation of No. 224 features no windows at first floor level in the side elevation and either windows to non-habitable rooms or secondary windows at ground floor level. The only windows in the side elevation of the proposed extension would be to bathrooms at ground and first floor. A condition is recommended requiring these to be obscurely glazed. The other opening in the side elevation would be at lower ground floor level only and given there exists a door on the side elevation at ground floor level at present, this isn't considered to result in a loss of amenity to the residents of 224 over and above the existing levels. Furthermore the front of the extension would be set back in line with the side extension of No. 224. Therefore given the scale, location and detail of the proposed extension it is considered the proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon the amenity of the occupants of No. 224 Washway Road.

- 14) In terms of the proposed impact the proposal would have on the occupants of flats 1-6 at Harboro Court located to the rear, the proposed extension would be located a similar distance to the rear boundary as the existing property retaining over 14m to the rear boundary with the flats. Additionally the south eastern side elevation of the block containing flats 1-6 Harboro Court features no windows. Consequently the proposal would have no detrimental impact upon the occupants of 1-6 Harboro Road in terms of residential amenity.
- 15) In terms of the impact of the proposal on the occupants of No. 230 Washway Road, given the location of the extension it is not considered the proposal would result in a loss of privacy, sense of enclosure or loss of sunlight or daylight to the occupants of No. 230 Washway Road. The proposal would result in an area for hard standing for car parking and vehicle turning at the front of the property however this would be set away from the boundary with No. 230 and in light of the existing noise as a result of the close proximity to the A56 it is not considered any minor increase in disturbance as a result of parked vehicles at the subject site could warrant a refusal of the application on these grounds. Similarly while the proposal would result in an increase in residential units with associated refuse bins, appropriate storage for refuse bins has been proposed at the site and while the movement of these on refuse collection days may result in short term disturbance it is not considered sufficient reason to warrant refusal of the application on these grounds.
- 16) Most new dwellings, including new build and conversions, should provide some private outdoor space. This does not include front or side garden areas open to view from roads, nor space needed to comply with parking standards. Private outdoor space is needed for a variety of functional requirements such as sitting

out, children's play and hanging washing. In accordance with the Council's guidelines for *New Residential Development (2004)* flats and apartments generally require 18 sq. m of adequately screened communal area per flat for the functional requirements. The area shown on the submitted plan would provide sufficient space for the existing and additional residential units and the site is within walking distance of Selsey Avenue Playing Fields and Walton Park.

17) Overall the proposal is not considered to result in a detrimental impact to the residential amenity enjoyed by the occupants of neighbouring residential properties.

Highway and Parking

18) The proposal provides 3 no additional residential one bedroom apartments. Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 3 *Parking Standards* (February 2012) states parking facilities at new developments will be required to meet appropriate layout and design standards and parking provision which meets the maximum standard will be appropriate in most circumstances (para 5.1.2)

19) The Local Highway Authority (LHA) was consulted on the proposal. The revised scheme proposes 2 car parking spaces to the front of the property alongside 5 spaces retained to the rear. With the existing accommodation at the site there would be 7 flats in total requiring 1 parking space each. Access to the car parking proposed to the front of the property would be via a new entrance off Washway Road. The LHA raises no objection to the proposal and subject to amended plans, showing a revised independent vehicle access off Washway Road, the proposal is considered to be acceptable on the grounds of highway safety and vehicle parking. An informative is recommended outlining any vehicle crossing works required to be carried out by Trafford Council as a result of the proposal would require the applicant to cover such expenses.

20) Cycle parking is proposed to the side of the extension and a condition is recommended requiring details to be submitted, prior to occupation of the development.

Landscaping

21) At present the subject area is laid to grass with paths of hard standing. Hard and soft landscaping is shown on the submitted plans, with two trees planted in the front garden area.

22) A condition is recommended for a landscaping scheme to be submitted to safeguard adequate tree planting and appropriate hard and soft landscaping of the site.

Planning Contributions

23) This proposal is subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and is located in the 'moderate zone' for residential development. Consequently private market houses would be liable to a CIL charge rate of £40 per square metre, and apartments would be liable to a CIL charge rate of £0 per square metre. No other planning contributions are required.

Conclusion

24) In conclusion, the proposed development would result in the creation of 3 new apartments with associated car parking. The scale, siting and design of the proposal pays due regard to its surroundings and the proposed extension would be subordinate to the main building. The development will not unduly impact upon the residential amenity of existing or future occupants in the vicinity. The development is considered to be in-line with all relevant Policies set out in the Trafford Core Strategy and relevant SPD's.


RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard
2. Compliance with plans
3. Materials
4. Landscaping
5. Provision and retention of parking and access
6. Provision and retention of cycle parking
7. Obscure glazing
8. Bin store

LB



226 Washway Road, Sale (site hatched on plan)



Scale: 1:1,250

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright 2012.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Organisation	Trafford Council
Department	Planning Service
Comments	Committee date 9/07/2015
Date	29/06/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

WARD: Brooklands

85620/VAR/15

DEPARTURE: NO

Variation of condition No.19 of planning permission ref. 77582/FULL/2011 (Demolition of existing building and erection of replacement car dealership unit including MOT bay, parking, access and landscaping) to allow the A1 (retail) and B1(b) (office) premises to be open between the hours of 08.30-17.30 on Saturdays and between 10.30-17.00 on Sundays; and also to allow the B1(c) (light industrial) and B8 (storage) premises to be open between the hours of 08.00-17.00 on Monday - Fridays.

253 Washway Road, Sale, M33 4BL

APPLICANT: Mr Nigel Wells - Peugeot Citroen Retail

AGENT: DJS Associates

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

Councillor Dixon has requested that this application be determined by the Planning Development Control Committee for reasons set out within the report

SITE

The application site is located on the south east side of Washway Road and measures approximately 1.78 hectares (7217 sq.m). It is currently occupied by a car dealership for Peugeot and Citroen dealers and carries out car sales, servicing and MOT of motor vehicles. The site frontage is dominated by an external car display with customer parking to the south, north and east boundaries. The MOT function is located on the south side of the building and the servicing workshop is located on the north side of the building.

The Life Centre is located to the north and the application site fronts Washway Road to the west. The application site is bounded by a vehicular track to the east, beyond which are the rear boundaries of residential properties fronting Alston Avenue and partially the side boundaries of properties fronting Raglan Road. The southern boundary is shared by rear boundaries of residential properties fronting Fairlands Road and the side boundary of 263 Washway Road. The site is covered by hard standing with scattered trees along the south and east boundaries.

PROPOSAL

This application has been made under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Section 73 allows applications to vary condition(s) previously imposed on a planning permission. A Section 73 planning permission is the grant of a new planning consent. However, the original planning permission continues to exist whatever the outcome of the application made under Section 73.

This application seeks to vary condition 19 of planning permission 77582/FULL/2011. This condition relates to the hour of operation of both the sales and services area. Condition 19 of the consent is worded as follows:-

SALES

The A1 and B1(b) premises shall not be open for customers to the public outside the following hours: -

*08:30 – 19:00, Mondays – Fridays
08:30 – 17:00, Saturdays; and
10:30 – 16:30 Sundays*

SERVICING

The B1(c) and B8 premises shall not be open for customers to the public outside the following hours: -

*08:30 - 17.00, Mondays – Fridays
08:30 – 13:00 Saturdays; and
Closed - Sundays and Bank Holidays*

Reason: *In the interest of residential amenity and in compliance with Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy.*

The applicant wishes to amend condition 19 to vary the hours of operation of both the service centre and the sales area. The opening hours of the sales area will be increased by 30 minutes on Saturdays (until 17.30) and Sundays (until 17.00); whilst the opening hours of the service centre will increase by 30 minutes (from 08.00) Monday to Friday. This application will regularise the current opening hours of the business.

Following submission of the application, the applicant has confirmed that they would be willing to prohibit the use of the jet wash before 08.30 Monday to Friday. This matter could be secured via imposition of an additional planning condition.

The proposed planning condition is detailed below:-

SALES

The A1 and B1 (b) premises shall not be open for customers to the public outside the following hours: -

*08:30 – 19:00, Mondays – Fridays
08:30 – 17:30, Saturdays; and
10:30 – 17:00 Sundays*

SERVICING

The B1(c) and B8 premises shall not be open for customers to the public outside the following hours: -

*8:00 - 17.00, Mondays – Fridays
08:30 – 13:00 Saturdays; and*

Closed - Sundays and Bank Holidays

Reason: *In the interest of residential amenity and in compliance with Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy.*

THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN IN TRAFFORD

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy** adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**, adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF; and
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 01 April 2012. On 25th January 2012 the Council resolved to adopt and bring into force the GM Joint Waste Plan on 1 April 2012. The GM Joint Waste Plan therefore now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2012. On the 13th March 2013, the Council resolved that the Minerals Plan, together with consequential changes to the Trafford Policies Map, be adopted and it came into force on the 26th April 2013. The GM Joint Minerals Plan therefore now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L5 – Climate Change

L8 – Planning Obligations

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

Immediately adjacent to A56 Strategic Route & Quality Bus Corridor

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

77582/FULL/2011 - Demolition of existing building and erection of replacement car dealership unit including MOT bay, parking, access and landscaping. Application approved 17th January 2013

81810/FULL/2013 - Installation of various external lighting across the site. Application approved 14th August 2014

80056/VAR/2013 - Application for minor material amendment relating to approved plans, condition 2 of application 77582/FULL/2011, to allow for the installation of additional vehicular loading door to southern elevation of workshop. Application approved 9th July 2013

80060/NMA/2013 - Non material amendment to application 77582/FULL/2012 for erection of replacement car dealership to increase the amount of glazing to the southern elevation of showroom. Application approved 27th March 2013

80190/AA/2013 - Installation of illuminated and non-illuminated signage to front and side elevation of building and installation of two externally illuminated totem signs to Washway Road and illuminated flag sign as well as flag signs to forecourt. Application approved 9th May 2013

81372/AA/2013 - Erection of 5 no. internally illuminated fascia signs, 1 no. externally illuminated free-standing totem signs, and 3 no. non-illuminated flag signs. Application approved 18th October 2013

H/58807 - Continued use of site of former petrol filling station for car display and sales. Application approved 23rd March 2004.

H/54043 – Change of use from petrol filling station to car display and sales for a temporary period of 12 months. Application approved 17th May 2002.

CONSULTATIONS

Local Highway Authority – No comments received to date

Pollution and Licensing – No objections subject to a condition restricting the use of the jet wash facility prior to 08:30 hours Monday to Friday.

REPRESENTATIONS

Councillor Dixon called in the application to planning committee to consider the adverse effects to occupiers of residential houses nearby.

Neighbours: 6 letters of representation have been received as a consequence of the planning application publicity. The following objections have been raised:-

- Light spill from the MOT bays to adjacent properties
- Increased noise from air conditioning vents and extractor fans
- Noisy activities on site prevent residents from enjoying their gardens
- The fence to the rear boundary of the site does not improve residents quality of life
- Impact on resident's quality of life
- Noise and smells from air conditioning unit and MOT fan
- The applicant has not adhered to the conditions on the original application which has caused stress to adjacent neighbouring properties
- Noise from the jet wash is intrusive and has not been managed properly
- The jet wash was not identified on the original plans
- Vehicle repairs are occurring outside of the workshop
- Noisy machinery should be enclosed

OBSERVATIONS

1. Members will be aware that the approval of a Section 73 application grants a new planning permission in its own right. In terms of decision making, regard should be had to any changes on site or in the surrounding area and any changes to planning policy.
2. There have been no significant changes to the site or the surrounding area since planning permission was granted, save for the implementation of the permission. The application was determined previously in accordance with the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the North West, the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy, the saved policies of the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan, and relevant supplementary planning documents. Since the application was approved, RSS was revoked on the 20th May 2013 and therefore it no longer forms part of the development plan for Trafford. Despite the revocation of RSS, it is considered that the previous assessment of the scheme against the Development Plan remains accurate.
3. The main planning issues considered under the previous application were:-
 - i. Principle of development
 - ii. Impact on residential amenity
 - a. Siting of the proposed building
 - b. Commercial operation of the site
 - iii. Design and impact on the street scene
 - iv. Access and parking
 - v. Security
 - vi. Trees
 - vii. Flood Risk
 - viii. Developer contributions

4. No further information has been submitted in support of the planning application. Information submitted in support of planning application 77582/FULL/2011 remains relevant to the determination of this application.
5. These matters listed above were considered by Members in the determination of the original application. There is no requirement to revisit these issues through this application. The key issues in the determination of this application relate to the following matters outlined below:-
 - i. Impact on residential amenity
 - ii. Conditions
 - iii. Developer contributions

IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

6. Since the scheme became operational, it has been operating in accordance with the proposed hours. This application has been submitted to regularise the consent following receipt of an enforcement complaint. It is acknowledged that the site has caused some amenity problems for neighbours but it is considered that it would not be reasonable to refuse the current application which proposes only limited increases of half an hour to the servicing use on Mondays to Fridays and to the Sales use on Saturdays and Sundays. The Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) has considered the proposed hours of operation and the noise associated with these activities and raises no objections. Discussions have taken place between the EHO and the applicant and it has been agreed that the jet wash will not be used prior to 0830 hours Monday to Friday. An additional planning condition has been proposed to secure this restriction of use.
7. Members will be aware that planning permission was granted for the installation of various external lighting across the site (reference 81810/FULL/2013). Condition 7 of this consent relates to the showroom display lighting and states that this lighting is to be turned to low level display lighting at 19.30 hours and turned off at 21.30 hours. The proposed amendment to opening hours of the Sales Area would have no impact on the operation of lighting within these areas. On this basis, it is considered that the proposed variation of condition 19 is acceptable.

CONDITIONS

8. It is important when considering an application to vary conditions that a Local Planning Authority is mindful of the six tests for the use of planning conditions, i.e. whether they are necessary, relevant to planning and the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. When assessing this application to vary condition 19, the Local Planning Authority should take note, in particular, of whether the conditions as currently worded are necessary and reasonable.
9. An application has been submitted to the Council to discharge conditions 3 (materials), 4 (boundary details), 5 (bat survey), 6 (tree protection measures),

7 (hard and soft landscaping), 8 (landscape maintenance), 13 (cycle storage), 14 (details of MOT and workshop doors), 16 (Site Management Plan), 17 (surface water regulation), and 18 ((crime prevention measures) attached to planning permission 77582/FUL/2011. A number of these conditions have been discharged or part discharged and as such the conditions of the original approval have been amended to reflect the current position. Where conditions are no longer necessary these will be removed.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

10. There was a S106 Agreement attached to the original consent which secured financial contributions towards Highways and Active Travel Infrastructure, Public Transport Schemes and Specific Green Infrastructure. The applicant has now fully discharged these financial obligations and as such there is no requirement to enter into a deed of variation in this instance.

11. The proposed development would not be liable for Community Infrastructure (CIL) contributions.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions:-

- 1) Standard 3 year time limit
- 2) Approved plans
- 3) Materials in accordance with approved details
- 4) Submission of boundary treatment details within 1 month of permission
- 5) Trees or shrubs planted or retained which are removed, uprooted, destroyed, die or become severely damaged or become seriously diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees or shrubs of similar size and species
- 6) Implementation of approved landscape maintenance measures
- 7) Provision of car parking spaces in accordance with approved details
- 8) Areas for the movement, loading, unloading and parking of vehicles shall be made available for those purposes at all times
- 9) Staff and customer parking shall not be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles and shall not be used for display, demonstration or storage of vehicles.
- 10) The existing vehicular access point into the site from the eastern boundary, accessed off Raglan Road, shall be permanently closed off
- 11) Within 1 month of the date of this permission, a scheme for onsite cycle storage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented within 2 months and shall be retained at all times thereafter.
- 12) All workshop and MOT bay external doors shall be kept closed when work involving the use of power tools and equipment is undertaken within the building.
- 13) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations contained in Section 6 entitled 'mitigation' of the 'Robin and Day Sale - Noise Assessment prepared by AECOM Environmental dated February 2012, received by the Local Planning Authority on 7th March 2012 unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

- 14) The use hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the site management measures identified within the approved Site Management Plan Revision B (dated June 2015), unless otherwise agreed in writing, and shall be retained thereafter.
- 15) The approved surface water drainage details shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details
- 16) Within 1 month of the date of this permission, a scheme detailing crime prevention measures associated with the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained thereafter
- 17) The A1 and B1 (b) premises shall not be open for customers to the public outside the following hours: -

08:30 – 19:00, Mondays – Fridays
08:30 – 17:30, Saturdays; and
10:30 – 17:00 Sundays

The B1(c) and B8 premises shall not be open for customers to the public outside the following hours: -


08:00 - 17.00, Mondays – Fridays
08:30 – 13:00 Saturdays; and
Closed - Sundays and Bank Holidays

- 18) No deliveries shall be taken at or dispatched from the site outside the following hours:
 - 08:30 – 19:00 Monday to Friday
 - 08:30 – 17:00 Saturdays; and
 - 10:30 – 16:30 Sundays
- 19) The use of the jet wash is prohibited before the hours of 08.30 Monday to Friday.

JP



253 Washway Road, Sale (site hatched on plan)



Scale: 1:1,250

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright 2012.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Organisation	Trafford Council
Department	Planning Service
Comments	Committee date 9/07/2015
Date	29/06/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

WARD: Urmston

85931/COU/15

DEPARTURE: No

Subdivision of the property at 190-192 Flixton Road to facilitate change of use to outreach centre and children's home.

ADDRESS: 190-192 Flixton Road, Flixton, M41 5DR

APPLICANT: Trafford Council

AGENT: None

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

SITE

This application relates to the property at 190-192 Flixton Road in Flixton.

The property which comprises five offices, two meeting rooms, an activities room, an art room and a play room together with associated kitchen and sanitary facilities is currently occupied by Trafford Council's Outreach Support Service.

The Outreach Team use the premises as an administrative base and as a site to provide support to children and families with the objective of allowing children to remain at home with their families. Those who attend the centre to receive support do so by referral from a social worker.

Pedestrian and vehicular access to the site is from Flixton Road, with car parking being provided on two driveways; one to the east and one to the west of the building. In total there are 7 car parking spaces provided at the site.

The application site is located within a predominantly residential area being bounded to the north, east and west by residential properties in a variety of styles. Abbotsfield Park is located to the south of the application site, on the opposite side of Flixton Road.

The site, which is unallocated, is located approximately 550m from the western edge of Urmston Town Centre.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought to sub-divide the property at 190-192 Flixton Road in order to provide an administrative and organisational centre for Trafford's Outreach Team and a 3 bed residential children's home for children aged between 11 and 18.

The Outreach Centre would comprise two offices, an office/direct work area and a direct work area together with associated kitchen and sanitary facilities. The centre, which would be used as an office base for the Outreach team as well as providing areas where the team can provide support and advice to children on both a one to one basis and in small groups of 2-3 children, will operate between 9am and 9pm seven days a week.

The Outreach team consists of a Manager, 3 Senior Assistants and a team of 12 Outreach Workers (9 Full time 3 part time) who work on a rota to cover the service, with 6 members of staff normally being on duty at any one time, many of whom will go out into the community to undertake their duties.

The outreach centre will be provided with 4 car parking spaces on the driveway located adjacent to 192 Flixton Road.

The proposed children's home would comprise 5 bedrooms; 3 for children and 2 for staff, a shared bathroom, kitchen and living/dining room together with an office area for staff.

The children's home would house 3 children aged between 11 and 18. The children will be cared for by a staff support team comprising a manager, 11 residential child care officers (7 full time and 4 part time) and 1 Senior Assistant. The support staff will work a rota of shifts where 3 or 4 staff will be on duty at the home during the day (8am to 10.30 pm) and 2 members of staff will sleep at the home during the night.

With the exception of staff and friends/family of the children residing at the home there will be limited visitors to the home; counsellors call once a month for a two hour visit and Ofsted visit twice a year. Doctors' appointments, healthcare advice etc. are normally delivered off the premises unless the child has phobias/issues with going out into the community/public places, with staff holding meetings offsite at other Council premises.

The children's home will be provided with 3 car parking spaces on the driveway located adjacent to 190 Flixton Road.

With the exception of the erection of new fencing to delineate the curtilage of the outreach centre and the children's home there are no external alterations proposed in order to facilitate the proposed development.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan in Trafford Comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially

supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.

- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan** (UDP), adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan**, adopted 1st April 2012 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.
- The **Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan**, adopted 26th April 2013 now forms part of the Development Plan in Trafford and will be used alongside district-specific planning documents for the purpose of determining planning applications.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

L1 - Land for new homes

L2 – Meeting Housing Needs

L4 – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

L7 – Design

L8 – Planning Obligations

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

None

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

None

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

H21787 – Change of use from a pair of semi-detached houses to a residential hostel for adolescents (No.192) and an independent living unit (No190) and provision of driveways and new vehicular accesses – Deemed consent 07.08.1985.

CONSULTATIONS

LHA – No objections; comments incorporated into the Observations section of the report

Greater Manchester Police Design for Security – No comments received to date

REPRESENTATIONS

No letters of representation have been received in response to this application.

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE

1. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF advises that at its heart is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking.
2. Paragraph 111 of the NPPF advises that planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value.
3. The proposal involves the conversion and re-use of an existing building, which is located in a sustainable location, approximately 550m from the western edge of Urmston Town Centre.
4. The proposed outreach centre would provide an administrative and organisational centre for the Council's Outreach Team, who would use the site as their office base while providing support within the community. The centre would also provide facilities where members of the team can provide advice, support and counselling for children who have issues which require discussion away from the family home. The proposed outreach centre is therefore considered to be a sui generis use.
5. The existing property has an established history of use as an outreach centre with the outreach team moving into part of the property in 2000 and expanding to occupy the whole of the building in 2009. Having regard to this it is considered that the continued use of part of 190-192 Flixton Road as an outreach centre is acceptable in principle.
6. Policy L2 of the Core Strategy, which is entitled "Meeting Housing Needs", states that all new residential development proposals will be assessed for the contribution that will be made to meeting the housing needs of the Borough and the wider aspirations of the Council's Sustainable Community Strategy. It requires new development to be (a) On a site of sufficient size to accommodate adequately the proposed use and all necessary ancillary facilities for prospective residents; (b) Appropriately located in terms of access to existing community facilities and/or delivers complementary improvements to the social infrastructure (schools, health facilities, leisure and retail facilities) to ensure the sustainability of the development; (c) Not harmful to the character or amenity of the immediately

surrounding area and; (d) To be in accordance with L7 and other relevant policies within the Development Plan for Trafford.

7. Having regard to the location of the application site within a residential area and given that the application property has formerly been used as a children's home for an extended period between the mid-1980s and 2009 it is not considered that there are any in principle issues with the introduction of a children's home at the site; the proposal to introduce a children's home at the site would help to provide for a specific type of need within the Borough in accordance with Policy L2 of the Trafford Core Strategy with the unit functioning in a way that is comparable to the other residential properties in the vicinity.

VISUAL AMENITY

8. One of the 12 core planning principles of the NPPF is to always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings (paragraph 17). Paragraph 56 of the NPPF states that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment - good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. Paragraph 64 of the NPPF states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.
9. Policy L7 of the Core Strategy states that in considering applications for development within the Borough, the Council will determine whether or not the proposed development meets the standards set in national guidelines and the requirements of Policy L7. The relevant extracts of Policy L7 require that development is appropriate in its context; makes best use of opportunities to improve the character and quality of an area by appropriately addressing scale, density, height, layout, elevation treatment, materials, landscaping; and is compatible with the surrounding area.
10. With the exception of the erection of fencing to delineate the curtilage of the outreach centre and the children's home no external alterations are proposed in order to facilitate the proposed change of use of the property.
11. The fencing proposed is timber panel fencing of 0.9m in height, which is typical in residential areas such as that where the application site is located and as such it is not considered that the introduction of the proposed fencing would have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of 190-192 Flixton Road.
12. For these reasons it is not considered the proposal to utilise 190-192 Flixton Road as an outreach centre and a children's home would have any impact upon the visual amenities of the area.

13. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with the thrust of the NPPF and the design policy within the Core Strategy.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

14. One of the 12 core planning principles of the NPPF is to always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings (paragraph 17).
15. Policy L7 of the Core Strategy states that in relation to matters of amenity protection development must not prejudice the amenity of future occupiers of the development and/or occupants of adjacent properties by reason of overbearing, overshadowing, overlooking, visual intrusion, noise or disturbance, odour or in any other way.
16. The application site is located within a predominantly residential area being bounded to the north, east and west by residential properties in a variety of styles. Abbotsfield Park is located to the south of the application site, on the opposite side of Flixton Road.
17. With the exception of the erection of fencing to delineate the curtilage of the outreach centre and the children's home no external alterations are proposed in order to facilitate the proposed change of use of the property.
18. Having regard to the siting and design of the proposed fencing and its relationship to neighbouring properties, it is not considered that the proposal raises any issues in terms of loss of light, privacy and/or overbearing impact.
19. In terms of noise and disturbance the application property is located on Flixton Road, which is a well trafficked route to and from Urmston Town Centre. Having regard to this, the fact that an outreach centre has operated from the premises without complaint to the Council's enforcement team or highway section since 2000 and given that the proposed children's home would function in the same way as a family dwelling, providing accommodation for three children who would be cared for by support staff, living together as a family unit, it is not considered that the proposal would result in neighbouring residents experiencing an unacceptable increase in the level of noise and disturbance they are exposed to.
20. With regard to the level of residential amenity future occupants of the proposed children's home would enjoy, the occupants of the home would be provided with adequate light and outlook from their habitable room windows. They would also have access to an area of useable amenity space in the form of a rear garden.
21. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the thrust of the NPPF as it would not adversely affect the level of residential amenity neighbouring residents can reasonably expect to

enjoy and the development would provide future occupants with a satisfactory standard of amenity.

PARKING AND HIGHWAY SAFETY

22. Policy L4 of the Trafford Core Strategy which relates to sustainable transport and accessibility, seeks to ensure that all new developments do not adversely affect highway safety, with each development being provided with adequate on-site parking in line with the maximum standards set out in appendix 3.
23. The outreach centre will be provided with 4 car parking spaces on the driveway located adjacent to 192 Flixton Road.
24. The children's home will be provided with 3 car parking spaces on the driveway located adjacent to 190 Flixton Road.
25. The Council's highway officer has reviewed the application and advised the parking arrangement involving cars being blocked on the drives by other cars is not ideal as all but the last car to arrive would be blocked in. The use of the car parking will however be a management issue, not a highway safety issue.
26. In terms of the level of parking provision the highway officer has advised the level of parking achievable at both properties is likely to be insufficient for the number of staff proposed to be based at each use. Notwithstanding this they have advised that most of the time the parking provision on site will be adequate for the proposed use, given that the outreach centre will house a number of staff who operate as mobile workers within the community, using the premises only as an office base, with the staff associated with the children's home working on a rota/ shift system, with a maximum number of 3/4 staff members being present at any one time.
27. The highway officer acknowledges that there may be times, for example at shift changes and when mobile staff report to the office, when there may be more demand for parking than that available within either site, however they consider that in view of the relatively small parking demand generated by the proposed uses any displacement parking can be easily accommodated without causing any significant parking difficulties within the area – there is on street parking available on both sides of Flixton Road which should be able to accommodate any displaced vehicles, despite the parking available on the opposite side of Flixton Road being busy throughout the day from use by visitors to Abbotsfield Park.
28. Having regard to the comments of the Council's highway officer it is considered that the proposed parking, access and servicing arrangements are acceptable and as such the proposal would not have any adverse impact upon highway safety and would not have any undue impacts on residential amenity. The development is

therefore considered to be in accordance with policy L4 of the Trafford Core Strategy.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

29. This application relates to the property at 190-192 Flixton Road which is currently operating as an outreach centre. The outreach centre has a floor area of 208.58sqm.
30. The proposal involves the subdivision of the property at 190-192 Flixton Road to create an outreach centre and children's home.
31. The application would not increase the floorspace at the site – the proposed outreach centre would have a floor area of 70.85sqm and the proposed children's home would have a floor area of 135.01sqm.
32. The outreach centre is a sui generis use and as such there is no charge associated with this element of the scheme - there is no charge associated with "all other development".
33. The children's home is considered to be an institutional facility (for the purposes of CIL) and as such the charge rate associated with this element of the scheme is £0 per square metre.


RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions:-

1. Time limit
2. Plans
3. Provision and retention of parking prior to first use of outreach centre and children's home
4. Hours of operation for outreach centre – 9am to 9pm seven days a week
5. Children's home only for a maximum of 3 children – no other uses within class C2 or C3

RH



190-192 Flixton Road, Flixton (site hatched on plan)



Scale: 1:1,250

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright 2012.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Organisation	Trafford Council
Department	Planning Service
Comments	Committee date 9/07/2015
Date	29/06/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)