

Public Document Pack



TRAFFORD
COUNCIL

AGENDA PAPERS FOR PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Date: Thursday, 14 May 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 9 th April, 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, 14 May 2015

Membership of the Committee

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

Further Information

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

Michelle Cody, Democratic Services Officer

Tel: 0161 912 2775

Email: michelle.cody@trafford.gov.uk

This agenda was issued on **Tuesday, 5 May 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

9th APRIL, 2015

PRESENT:

Councillor Mrs. Ward (In the Chair),
Councillors Dr. Barclay, Bunting, Chilton, N. Evans, Fishwick, Gratrix, O'Sullivan,
Mrs. Reilly, Smith, Stennett MBE and Whetton.

In attendance: Head of Planning Services (Mr. R. Haslam),
Deputy Team Leader – North Area (Mr. S. Day),
Senior Planner (North Area) (Mrs. V. Ward),
Highways Development Control Officer (Mr. D. Mason),
Head of Legal – Environment (Mr. L. Patel),
Democratic & Scrutiny Officer (Miss M. Cody).

APOLOGY

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Walsh.

69. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 12th March, 2015, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

70. 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.

71. 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

Application No., Name of Applicant, Address or Site

Description

84315/FUL/14 – Manchester United Limited – Manchester United Football Club, Isherwood Road, Carrington.

Installation of 16m floodlighting columns on existing training pitches with associated transformers, and the erection of 5m and 8m fencing, and substation building.

[Note: Councillor Whetton declared a Personal Interest in Application 84315/FUL/14, being a former employee of the Applicant and also a season ticket holder.
Councillors Dr. Barclay and Fishwick both declared a Personal Interest in Application

Planning Development Control Committee
9th April, 2015

84315/FUL/14 being season ticket holders.]

84468/FUL/14 – Trafford Housing Trust – Stretford House, Chapel Lane, Stretford.

External alterations to existing tower block to include new cladding, installation of new windows, and the erection of enclosed entrance pod to ground floor.

84481/FUL/14 – Trafford Housing Trust – 1 Circle Court, Stretford.

External alterations to existing tower block to include new cladding, installation of new windows, and the erection of enclosed entrance pod to ground floor.

(b) Permission refused for the reasons now determined

Application No., Name of Applicant, Address or Site

Description

82525/O/2014 – Canmoor Developments Ltd – Monde Trading Estate, Westinghouse Point, Trafford Park.

Outline application for demolition of existing industrial building and redevelopment of site to form petrol filling station with associated 370sqm kiosk unit and car wash; erection of 795sqm of A3 floor-space, provided within 2no. drive-thru café/restaurant units. Formation of new vehicular access, circulation roads within site, and areas of car parking (consent sought for access only with all other matters reserved).

[Note: Councillor Mrs. Reilly declared a Personal and Prejudicial Interest in Application 82525/O/2014, due to her involvement as a member of the TfGM Sub-Committee for the Metrolink, she remained in the meeting but did not participate in the debate or cast a vote on the Application.

Councillor Chilton declared a Personal Interest in Application 82525/O/2014, being a TfGM Committee member, however, he has had no involvement with the Application.]

(c) 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 through-out.

[Consideration of Application 84541/FUL/14 was deferred to allow further consideration of the points raised in the letters of objection.]

Planning Development Control Committee
9th April, 2015

(d) Application withdrawn

Application No., Name of Applicant, Address or Site

Description

84672/FUL/15 – Trafford Housing Trust – Land to the south of Lowther Gardens, Flixton.

Erection of 4 no. 2 storey houses and associated parking, landscaping, boundary treatments and highways alterations.

72. APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION 84391/FUL/14 – TRAFFORD MV RUGBY CLUB – TRAFFORD MVR FCC, FINNY BANK ROAD, SALE

The Head of Planning Services submitted a report concerning an application for planning permission for the demolition of portion of existing clubhouse and erection of a single storey link extension to provide new community room and kitchen.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions now determined and to the following additional condition:-

6. With the exception of the evening events permitted within Condition 4 of this permission, there shall be no use of the Clubhouse building outside of the following hours:-

07:00 – 23:30 Monday to Friday

07:00 – 00:30 Saturdays

07:00 – 23:00 Sundays

73. PROPOSED STOPPING UP OF HIGHWAYS AT OAKDENE ROAD/ARDERNE ROAD, TIMPERLEY WA15 6ES

The Contracts Director and Acting Head of Highways submitted a report advising Members of an application made to the Secretary of State for Transport under S247 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 to stop up two areas of highway in Timperley, in order to enable development to be carried out in accordance with planning permission 83734/FULL/2014.

RESOLVED: That no objection be raised to the application.

The meeting commenced at 6.30 p.m. and concluded at 7.33 p.m.

This page is intentionally left blank



PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 14th MAY 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 BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 14th May 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
<u>82014</u>	L & M Ltd, Norman Road, Altrincham, WA14 4ES	Altrincham	1	Minded to Grant
<u>84283</u>	Units C & D, Atlantic Street Retail Park, Atlantic Street, Altrincham, WA14 5BW	Broadheath	8	Grant
<u>84790</u>	Former Trafford Metal Finishers, Warwick Road South, Stretford, M16 0JR	Longford	17	Grant
<u>84827</u>	Breydon, Aylwin Drive, Sale, M33 3WG	Brooklands	29	Grant
<u>84883</u>	Victoria Gospel Hall, 119 Church Road, Flixton, M41 9ET	Flixton	37	Grant
<u>84982</u>	Unit 5A Stretford Mall Extension, Stretford Shopping Mall, Chester Road, Stretford, M32 9BA	Stretford	47	Grant
<u>85020</u>	130A Flixton Road, Urmston	Urmston	60	Grant
<u>85116</u>	31 Honiton Way, Altrincham, WA14 4UW	Altrincham	69	Refuse
<u>85173</u>	31 Grove Lane, Hale, WA15 8JF	Hale Central	78	Grant

WARD: Altrincham

82014/FULL/2013

DEPARTURE: No

Redevelopment of site to include: conversion of existing Boiler House and erection of three storey extension to provide 17 apartments; erection of 24 apartments between retained gable ends of existing Traveller Bay building and provision of parking on ground floor; retention of existing Linotype Office Building as offices; retention of Matrix Building facade; demolition of other existing buildings; erection of 121 new dwellings and construction of associated access roads, car parking and site landscaping.

L & M Ltd, Norman Road, Altrincham, WA14 4ES

APPLICANT: Morris Homes (North) Ltd and L and M Ltd

AGENT: Calderpeel Architects

RECOMMENDATION: MINDED TO GRANT SUBJECT TO LEGAL AGREEMENT

This application was considered at the 13th November 2014 Planning Development Control Committee where Members resolved to grant planning permission, subject to a legal agreement to require 16 affordable units on the site and an “overage” clause to ensure that an appropriate commuted sum up to a maximum equivalent to 49 affordable units is provided should the developer’s level of net profit be better than predicted in the viability appraisal. The applicant has since requested an amendment to the “overage” provisions.

OBSERVATIONS

BACKGROUND

At the 13th November 2014 meeting of the Planning Development Control Committee it was resolved to grant planning permission for the above development, subject to conditions and a legal agreement. The legal agreement was required to secure 16 affordable units on the site and to include an overage clause to ensure that an appropriate commuted sum up to a maximum equivalent to 49 affordable units is provided should the developer’s level of net profit be better than predicted in the viability appraisal.

The “overage” provisions were considered necessary given the shortfall in affordable housing being provided, having regard to the applicant’s viability case. Policy L2 of the Core Strategy states that 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%, which equates to a requirement for 65 of the 162 dwellings to be affordable. The applicant submitted a viability appraisal with the application which concluded this amount of affordable housing provision would

negatively impact on the scheme's viability. The appraisal identifies a number of abnormal costs attributed to this site (abnormal foundations, abnormal roads, remediation, utilities and drainage) and also the costs associated with the conversion of the Boiler House, retention of parts of the Traveller Bay and Matrix Building, refurbished walls and external works. The applicant stated an increased level of affordable housing would not provide a competitive return to the landowner and provide sufficient incentive for its redevelopment to proceed. The appraisal concludes that the need for the retention of the heritage assets on the site outweighs the need for providing the full requirement of affordable housing. It was agreed that the scheme will provide 10% affordable housing provision (16 units) and that the location and tenure will be agreed at a later date.

Whilst the provision of 16 affordable units is significantly below the requirement for a development of this size, it was acknowledged in this case that the need to retain existing listed buildings and to convert or incorporate elements into the design of new buildings, incurs a greater cost than a more typical form of development. Having regard to the viability appraisal, the importance of the heritage asset and the regeneration and economic benefits that the development would bring it was considered this reduced level of affordable housing is acceptable.

Given that the appraisal is based on current circumstances and predictions and that the development is likely to take a number of years to complete, it was recommended that a S106 agreement be entered into which has an "overage" type clause for a commuted sum up to a maximum equivalent to 49 dwellings (as 16 are being provided on site and the requirement is 65 affordable dwellings) and this sum to contribute towards affordable housing provision in the Borough, should the developer's level of net profit be better than predicted in the viability appraisal.

The applicant has since advised that the requirement for "overage" provisions is not justified for a development of this kind and on this scale and the development would not be a phased development. The applicant has referred to a recent Inspector's appeal decision relating to a case where it was determined an overage clause was contrary to the Planning Practice Guidance and failed to meet the tests for planning obligations set out in the CIL Regulations 2010 and in the NPPF.

The applicant has also referred to RICS guidance on re-appraisals which states a re-appraisal is generally suited to phased schemes over the longer term rather than a single phase scheme to be implemented immediately and which requires certainty. The applicant has advised the L & M development will be a single phase scheme.

As an alternative to the requirement for an overage clause the applicant has proposed that they will commence the development within 6 months from the date that the legal agreement is completed and to complete the development within 5 years from commencement of development. In the event the development is not completed within 5 years then there would be a requirement for the applicant to submit a Post Construction Viability Assessment (PCVA) to the Council and if the PCVA shows a Surplus, the

applicant will pay 50% of that Surplus to the Council up to a maximum sum which would be the equivalent to the provision of up to 49 affordable units on site.

ASSESSMENT

It is acknowledged that commencement of development within 6 months and completion of the development within 5 years would deliver housing in a relatively short term timescale compared to the timescale over which it could possibly be delivered otherwise i.e. development could otherwise potentially commence in up to 3 years' time and not have a completion date as the developer could take as long as necessary to complete the scheme. The developer could also potentially choose not to build out the entire scheme and therefore not deliver all 162 units or convert all the listed buildings proposed to be retained. This commitment therefore provides a degree of certainty that development will commence and be completed in the short term, although at the expense of any "overage" payment towards affordable housing that might otherwise have been due in the event the developer's net profit is better than predicted in the viability appraisal on completion.

In the event the developer commences within 6 months and completes within 5 years this will result in the delivery of a significant amount of housing, including 16 affordable units, on a committed housing site, on previously developed land in a sustainable location and which would ensure the future of the listed building. This would make a significant contribution to the Council achieving its overall housing land supply target and secure the re-use of this important site and listed buildings.

Having regard to the above it is considered the proposed variation to the previously approved terms of the legal agreement can be accepted.

In the event the applicant fails to commence the development within 6 months, or fails to complete the development within 5 years, then the overage clause will apply as per the previous resolution of the committee.

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 (16 units) on the site and for either of the following to apply:

- i) development to commence within 6 months of the date of the planning permission and the development to be completed within 5 years from commencement of the development, or
- ii) in the event the development has not commenced within 6 months of the date of the planning permission, or is not completed within 5 years from commencement of the development, the applicant shall submit a Post

Construction Viability Assessment (PCVA) to the Council and if the PCVA shows a Surplus, the applicant will pay 50% of that Surplus to the Council up to a maximum sum which would be the equivalent to the provision of up to 49 affordable units on site (figure to be agreed by the Head of Planning); and

(B) In the circumstances where the S106 Agreement 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; 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. Approved plans
3. Samples of materials to be submitted and approved
4. Landscaping scheme to be submitted and approved, including full details of all hard and soft landscaping (to include tree planting and other specific green infrastructure), boundary treatments, within the site and scheme for historic interpretation and public art.
5. Landscape maintenance
6. Tree protection scheme
7. Travel Plan
8. Means of access (including access for emergency vehicles) and areas for the movement, loading, unloading and parking of vehicles to be provided, constructed and surfaced in complete accordance with the approved plans
9. Provision and retention of car parking as shown on approved site plan
10. Retention of garages for vehicle parking, garages shall not be converted to living accommodation
11. Full details of secure cycle parking for the Boiler House, Traveller Bay and office use to be submitted and approved
12. Provision and retention of visibility splays – at Plot 3 and the junction of Lawrence Road with Norman Road
13. Contaminated land Phase 1 report, and submission and approval of subsequent investigations, risk assessment and remediation as necessary
14. Programme of archaeological building recording be undertaken, commencing ahead of the commencement of demolition
15. Detailed schedule of works / methodology for demolition to be submitted and approved
16. Detailed schedule of works for making good / new works to rear elevation of the office building to be submitted and approved
17. Details of the proposed dummy windows to front elevation of Matrix Building to be submitted and approved
18. Detailed specification for the boundary walls to canal frontage and Lady Kelvin Road to be submitted and approved
19. Prior to any part of the development hereby permitted being first brought into residential use and which is identified as requiring noise mitigation measures in the

Peninsular Acoustics Report “Noise assessment for the proposed residential development at the ‘Former L and M site’ Broadheath, Altrincham” (received 11 April 2014), the scheme of noise mitigation measures detailed in Sections 5, 6 and 7 of the Report shall be implemented and retained as such thereafter. Written confirmation of the completion of noise insulation works, with confirmation of glazing and ventilation systems installed and the design of the properties, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.


20. No development approved by this planning permission shall take place until such time as a scheme to limiting surface water run-off has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.
21. No development approved by this planning permission (or such other date or stage in development as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority), shall take place until a scheme that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority:
 - 1) A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
 - all previous uses
 - potential contaminants associated with those uses
 - a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors
 - potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.
 - 2) A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.
 - 3) The results of the site investigation and detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
 - 4) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.Any changes to these components require the express written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.
22. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the local planning authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.
23. The site must be drained on a separate system, with only foul drainage connected into the foul sewer. Surface water should discharge to the nearby canal to meet the requirements of the NPPF (PPS1 (22) and PPS25 9F8)) and part H3 of the Building Regulations.
24. No surface water from this development is discharged either directly or indirectly to the combined sewer network.

25. Development to be in accordance with recommendations of bat survey
26. Construction management scheme – to include details of wheel wash, noise and dust mitigation measures for construction period, site compound, construction traffic and site parking to be submitted and agreed and development to be carried out in accordance with the agreed scheme
27. Removal of permitted development rights for extensions, garages and other outbuildings to all approved dwellings (plots 1 to 122 inclusive) and in addition removal of permitted development rights for roof additions and alterations and boundary treatment to plots 4 to 51.
28. No development shall commence until a Crime Prevention Plan to include measures to reduce opportunities for crime has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with these approved details.

RG



L & M Ltd, Norman Road, Altrincham (Site hatched on plan)



Scale: 1:2,750

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 14/05/2015
Date	30/04/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

WARD: Broadheath

84283/VLA/14

DEPARTURE: NO

Variation of the Section 106 Agreement between Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council and Allied Maples Group Ltd and Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council, dated 2 December 1994, to permit 30% of the net sales area (up to 465 sq. m) to be used for the sale of food retail goods.

Units C & D, Atlantic Street Retail Park, Atlantic Street, Altrincham, WA14 5BW

APPLICANT: Greater Manchester Pension Fund

AGENT: Savills (UK) Ltd

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT VARIATION OF THE LEGAL AGREEMENT

SITE

Retail unit within Atlantic Street Retail Park, known as Unit C/D and adjacent to the existing B&Q retail unit. The site is located on the south side of the Retail Park and south of Atlantic Street. The site has access from Atlantic Street and Davenport Road. The unit is currently vacant and was originally occupied by MFI and subsequently by Allied Carpets and Dreams.

The area is predominantly commercial in character and comprises retail and industrial premises, with retail to the north and east on the Retail Park and industrial sites to the west. The adjacent property on the east side is a B&Q retail unit and to the west side is a sub-station. To the south the site adjoins the Bridgewater Canal, beyond which are apartments in the Budenberg HAUS Projekte.

PROPOSAL

An application has been made under Section 106 A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and the Town and Country Planning (Modification and Discharge of Planning Obligations) Regulations 1992 to modify the Section 106 Legal Agreement dated 2nd December 1994 between Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council/Allied Maples Group Ltd and Trafford Borough Council to enable 30% of the net sales area (up to 465sqm) to be used for the sale of food retail goods. The 1994 s106 agreement replaced two earlier Section 52 legal agreements, one dated 24th September 1982 and one dated 4th September 1986. A recent approval has established the lawfulness of the sale of non-food goods from this part of the retail park.

Units C/D currently operate as two units. However, the market interest from large format discount variety operators has been to take the whole floor area, which measures approximately 1,938 sq. m Gross Internal Area (GIA). This would return the

floorspace to its original configuration as one unit. The net sales area is forecast to be 1,550 sq. m (i.e. 80% of the GIA). 30% of the net sales area is forecast to be 465 sq. m (i.e. 30% of 1,550 sq. m).

The applicant has drafted a new legal Agreement which proposes the discharge of the provisions of the existing Section 106 Agreement, dated 2 December 1994 and new provisions to restrict the amount and type of food goods that can be sold within the unit. These new provisions seek to ensure that a small amount of food goods can be sold from the retail unit and that the proposed food to be sold would be largely 'non-perishable' in nature, rather than fresh chilled or frozen food and there would not be an in-store bakery, butcher, fishmonger, etc. It is important to note that drinks are already permitted to be sold from the unit under the terms of the existing Agreement. This approach would be consistent with the operational model of the type of discount variety retailers sought by the applicant such as B&M Bargains, Home Bargains, etc. The following proposed provisions are included within the draft new legal agreement:

- "1. The Owner covenants that no part of the Property will be used for the sale of food unless the following conditions are met (in which case, for the avoidance of doubt, the sale of food shall not be a breach of this covenant):*
 - 1.1 the Property is used as a single Class A1 retail unit; and*
 - 1.2 the Property is used for the sale of non-food goods in addition to food; and*
 - 1.3 the amount of floorspace at the Property used for the sale of food does not exceed 30% (465 sq.m) of the net sales area of the retail unit or 30% (581 sq. m) of the gross internal area; and*
 - 1.4 the Property will not contain an in-store bakery, fishmongers or butchers; and*
 - 1.5 other than the sale of confectionary, including ice-cream and drink, the retail sale and display of chilled and frozen food goods is restricted to a floor area that does not exceed 10% (155 sq.m) of the net sales area or 10% (194 sq.m) of the gross internal area."*

No external alterations are proposed to the unit or the adjacent parking/service area.

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 01 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

W2 – Town Centres and Retail

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

S12 - Retail Warehouse Park Developments

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

S12 - Retail Warehouse Park Developments

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

There have been numerous previous applications, including for alterations, advertisements, etc. that are not directly relevant to this application. The following permissions relating to the original development are relevant: -

83715/CLEUD/2014 – Land at B&Q, Atlantic Street Retail Park, Altrincham WA14 5BT - Application for Certificate of Lawfulness for existing use of the site for the sale of any non-food within Use Class A1. Approved 23/10/2014. This established the lawfulness of the sale of non-food goods from this part of the retail park.

83673/CLEUD/2014 – Unit B, Atlantic Street Retail Park, Altrincham WA14 5BT - Application for Certificate of Lawfulness for existing use of the site for the sale of any non-food within Use Class A1. Approved 23/10/2014. This established the lawfulness of the sale of non-food goods from this part of the retail park.

82668/CLEUD/2014 - Unit C/D, Atlantic Street Retail Park, Altrincham, WA14 5BT - Application for Certificate of Lawfulness for existing use of the site for the sale of any non-food goods within Use Class A1. Approved 16/06/2014. This established the lawfulness of the sale of non-food goods from this part of the retail park.

H/ARM/24170 - Approval of landscaping details following the grant of outline planning

permission (ref H/OUT/22575) for the erection of a retail unit for sale of flat pack and self-assembly furniture, floor coverings, DIY/decorating materials, along with car parking facilities. Approved 24/10/1986

H/OUT/22575 - Demolition of existing factory premises and erection of building (20,700 sq ft) for the retail sale of flat-pack and self-assembly furniture, floor coverings of a quality normally laid by the householder and DIY and decorating materials. Provision of car parking facilities involving the re-organisation of the existing MFI car park and the construction of 2 new vehicular accesses to Davenport Lane. Approved 04/09/1986

H/OUT/21563 – Demolition of existing factory premises and erection of building (1260 sq.m) for the retail sale of flat pack and self-assembly furniture, floor coverings of a quality that are normally laid by the householder and DIY decorating materials. Approved 06/05/1986

H16454 - Erection of retail store (26,000 sq ft gross) for flat pack furniture, carpets and floor coverings and construction of access and service area to be shared with adjacent DIY store. Approved 24/09/1982

H15602 - Erection of retail store for flat pack furniture, carpets and floor coverings. Approved 07/05/1982

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

In support of the application, the applicant has produced a supporting retail planning statement plus addendum, a transport statement plus addenda and copies of the original Section 106 Agreement and relevant High Court and planning appeal decisions.

CONSULTATIONS

Legal Services – Comments incorporated into the Observations section below.

LHA – Comments incorporated into the Observations section below.

Strategic Planning – Comments incorporated into the Observations section below.

Electricity North West – the proposal would have no impact on the Electricity Distribution System infrastructure or other ENW assets.

Manchester Ship Canal Company – no comments received.

REPRESENTATIONS

None received

OBSERVATIONS

1. Under Section 106A(6) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, where an application is made to an authority under subsection (3), the authority may determine:
 - (a) that the planning obligation shall continue to have effect without modification;
 - (b) if the obligation no longer serves a useful purpose, that it shall be discharged; or
 - (c) if the obligation continues to serve a useful purpose, but would serve that purpose equally well if it had effect subject to the modifications specified in the application, that it shall have effect subject to those modifications.
2. The planning merits of the use, including the appropriateness of food retail sales in this out of centre location are therefore relevant to the consideration of the application in order to determine the extent to which the obligation continues to serve a useful purpose.
3. It is evident from the original planning permission for the building, its subsequent occupation by MFI and others and the granting of the certificate of lawful existing use that the authorised use of the unit is A1 retail and the type of non-food products that may be sold from the premises is not restricted by condition. Control over the building and what goods may be retailed from it is contained within the terms of the section 106 agreement dated 2nd December 1994. Clauses 3 and 4 of the agreement effectively prohibit the sale of food (save for confectionary sales ancillary to a non-food use).
4. It is considered that the restriction of the sale of food and continuation of control over the retail activities continues to serve a useful purpose. This issue is not disputed by the Applicant as they have not proposed an unrestricted retail use. Rather they accept the need for appropriate control over the retail activity that ensures that the proposals conform to those tested as part of the application and provide adequate safeguards to protect existing facilities. Hence, it is the case that, having regard to the precise nature of this proposal that is the subject of the current application, a new legal agreement would serve the planning purpose of the original restriction equally well if it had effect subject to the modifications proposed in the application and referred to in the Proposals section of this report.
5. It is considered that, having regard to the nature of the application, the imposition of the new obligation would meet the statutory and policy tests set out in NPPF paragraph 204 in respect of such obligations in that:
 - it is **necessary** to make the development acceptable in planning terms because without an obligation restricting the amount and type of food goods that could be sold from the unit, this “out of centre” facility would have the

potential to harm sequentially preferable existing retail facilities within designated centres in the Borough;

- it is **directly related** to the development as it would apply solely to the application site and is concerned with controlling the type and amount of food goods proposed as part of this development; and
- it is **fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind** to the development in that it is focused purely on the food retail aspect of the proposal and seeks to restrict the sale of food goods no more than is necessary in planning terms.

6. Having regard to the nature of the application that has been submitted, the issue in this case is whether the use of 30% of the net sales area for the sale of food goods (and 10% for chilled or frozen food goods) is acceptable in planning terms.

RETAIL TESTS

7. Paragraph 24 of the National Planning Policy Framework states the need for “a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan”.
8. As the application is for a bespoke type of retailing facility, the proposal's characteristics have been tested. An open A1 application has not been tested nor has it been necessary to do so. As the type of retailing activity that is proposed can be adequately controlled by the terms of a replacement planning agreement it is not considered appropriate or necessary to test for an open A1 food retail use of the buildings. It was agreed with the applicant that, given the relatively limited catchment for this kind of retail facility, it was appropriate to look for sequentially preferable sites with Altrincham and Sale Town Centres only.
9. In their retail planning statement, the applicant identified the market and locational characteristics for the proposed retail use are for sites that have:
 - The ability to sell both bulky and non-bulky non-food goods as well as ancillary food and drink products
 - A demised at grade customer car park of an appropriate size directly adjacent to the retail unit to allow the safe and direct transfer of goods from store to customer vehicle, in particular for the purchase of bulky goods and food items
 - The provision of an outside area to store trolleys
 - The provision of a sales area on a single level ground floor level to facilitate trolley shopping and the transfer of bulky goods purchases from store to customer modes of transport
10. The applicant identified one site within Altrincham Town Centre (82 – 84 George Street) that was discounted as not being suitable owing to the limited available floor space (425sqm GIA) of the units. It is agreed that this site would

not be suitable for the proposed use. There would be no other units that would be suitable in terms of floorspace requirements (approx. 2,000sqm).

11. The applicant identified a number of vacant town centre units and possible sites within Sale Town Centre including 12 The Square which at 840sqm GIA was considered to be too small and the former Friar's Court office site (now demolished) which at 1736sqm in size is again too small to provide the store and associated necessary car parking, trolley storage, etc.. In addition, the applicant argues that sites in Sale would not meet the operational and market requirements of the proposal in Broadheath in that the amount of trade drawn from the Sale catchment area would be limited as the store would principally draw its trade from the Altrincham area. Therefore, a store in Sale would be serving a different market and not meeting the need that the proposal at Broadheath is seeking to meet.
12. Having considered the applicant's evidence in relation to the above proposal, it is considered that there are no suitable, available or viable sites within either Altrincham or Sale Town Centre for the proposed use. The proposal is therefore consistent with Trafford Core Strategy Policy W2 and the sequential test in paragraph 24 of NPPF.
13. The applicant has correctly noted that because the floorspace falls below the required threshold of 2,500sqm, an impact test would not be required for this particular proposal. However, it should be noted that the likely impact on Altrincham or Sale Town Centre would be minimal considering the proposal would allow for only a small amount of retail floorspace being used for the sale of food goods.
14. In conclusion the application complies with the tests set out in the NPPF and Policy W2 of the Core Strategy, subject to an amended clause to limit food sales to the type and amount applied for.

HIGHWAYS IMPLICATIONS

15. The applicant submitted a supporting Transport Statement and two addendum reports in response to the Local Highways Authority concerns about the methodology used and in particular the potential impact of Saturday peak trips on the highways network and parking at the site. The LHA was ultimately satisfied that the change of use would result in no material impact on the highway network and the resulting additional parking demand can be accommodated on the site. The LHA therefore has no objection to the application.

CIL / DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

16. Since the original planning permission the Community Infrastructure Levy has been implemented, therefore the proposal to create new food retail floorspace within the existing unit may be liable to CIL. With reference to the CIL Charging

Schedule, as the building has been in a retail use for a continuous period of more than 6 months within the last 3 years (the unit was vacated by Dreams bed retailer in approximately April 2013), the proposal would be exempt from CIL.

CONCLUSION

17. The lawful use of the premises for non-food and drink A1 retail use is not disputed. With regards to whether a limited amount of the floorspace of the premises can be used for the sale of food goods, the applicant has demonstrated that there are no sequentially-preferable sites within or on the edge of nearby centres and that the highways impacts of the proposal are acceptable.
18. The proposal is therefore consistent with Policies L4, L7 and W2 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy in these regards. It is considered that the variation of a legal agreement in the way set out above would be an appropriate way to secure the proposed development.

RECOMMENDATION


GRANT VARIATION OF LEGAL AGREEMENT

It is recommended that the application to discharge and modify the s106 Agreement dated 2nd December 1994 between Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council/Allied Maples Group Ltd and Trafford Borough Council as set out in the report be granted subject to the completion of an appropriate legal agreement to secure the said modifications.

MJW



Units C & D, Atlantic Street Retail Park, Atlantic 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 14/05/2015
Date	30/04/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

DEMOLITION OF VACANT INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS AND REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE TO CREATE 60NO. APARTMENTS WITHIN 3NO. THREE-STOREY BUILDINGS. PROVISION OF CAR PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND BOUNDARY TREATMENT WORKS THROUGHOUT.

Former Trafford Metal Finishers, Warwick Road South, Stretford, M16 0JR

APPLICANT: Adactus Housing Group Ltd.

AGENT: Howard & Seddon

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

SITE

This application relates to a former industrial site that provides a 120m frontage onto Warwick Road South in Stretford. The land is rectangular in shape and is bound to its northern side by a printing company and to the south by a hand car wash and garage facility. To the west, on the opposite side of Warwick Road South, is a series of semi-detached houses and St. Hilda's Parish Church. To the rear (east) of the site is a large area of allotment gardens and Warwick Court, a quiet residential cul-de-sac.

The site itself houses a series of industrial sheds that were last in use as a metal finishers, but have since stood vacant for some time. The buildings are set back from the highway but span the full extent of the Warwick Road South frontage. All of them extend right up to the rear boundary of the site, including the section that adjoins the Warwick Court properties. The highest of the sheds stands at approximately 9m.

Efforts have been made to secure the units, however the site has regularly become the target of antisocial behaviour, fly-tipping and drug-use since it was vacated.

This arm of Warwick Road South links Kings Road with the Old Trafford Metrolink station. The highway here is wide and is regularly used as a place to park by commuters and visitors to the nearby Mosque and, on event days, the Old Trafford sports stadia.

PROPOSAL

This application seeks consent to demolish all of the vacant industrial buildings on the site and redevelop it to create 60no. affordable apartments within three distinct blocks, each measuring three-storeys in height. The buildings would be evenly spaced along the Warwick Road South frontage, with vehicular access achieved via the gaps between them. Amenity space and car parking would be provided to the rear. Thirty of the proposed units would be one-bed apartments, whilst the remaining flats would provide two bedrooms of accommodation.

Discussions have taken place with the applicant to seek improvements to the design and visual appearance of the 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; 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 CORE STRATEGY POLICIES/PROPOSALS

- L1 – Land for New Homes
- L2 - Meeting Housing Market Needs
- L4 – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility
- L5 – Climate Change
- L7 – Design
- L8 – Planning Obligations

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

The application site falls within the boundaries of the Partington Priority Regeneration Area

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 27 March 2012. The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. With immediate effect the NPPF replaces 44 documents including Planning Policy Statements; Planning Policy Guidance; Minerals Policy Statements; Minerals Policy Guidance; Circular 05/2005:Planning Obligations; and various letters to Chief Planning Officers. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

79462/O/2012 - Outline application for the erection of up to 29 no. dwellings, following demolition of industrial premises with all matters reserved – Approved with Conditions 10th February 2013.

H/60853 – Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a three-storey block of offices and 3 blocks of three-storey town houses (12 in total) and 2 blocks of three-storey apartments (12 in total). Construction of 3 access – Approved with Conditions, 20th April 2007.

H/OUT/55737 – Demolition of existing industrial premises and erection of residential development – Withdrawn 20th March 2003

H/OUT/57057 – Development of land for residential purposes following the demolition of existing industrial premises – 24th May 2013.

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has submitted a Design and Access Statement; Ecological Report; Crime Impact Statement; Flood Risk Assessment; Drainage Strategy Report; Affordable Housing Statement; Geo-Environmental Desk Study; Transport Statement; and Framework Travel Plan as part of their application. The information provided within these documents is discussed, where relevant, within the Observations section of this report.

CONSULTATIONS

LHA: The development proposes to provide a level of car parking that falls below the recommended standards set out in SPD3. However the evidence submitted within the transport statement and accompanying survey suggests that car ownership will be lower in this ward, and for this type of development, than elsewhere within the Borough. As such it is likely that the 11 on-street spaces shown on the site plan would accommodate any demands for resident or visitor parking from the development that might occur in excess of the 50 off-street spaces within the development.

The proposed footway build-outs adjacent to the site accesses should be secured through a s278 Agreement, at the cost of the developer, and should be accompanied by TRO's to prevent vehicles parking on them.

Pollution & Licensing:

Contaminated Land: There is a high potential for contamination of the site and the wider environment to have occurred which needs to be quantified and remediated to prevent any risks to future site users and the environment. This has been confirmed in the Phase I site report. A Phase II report should be submitted and implemented.

Nuisance: No objections, subject to suitable noise attenuation measures being incorporated into the south-eastern end of Block 3.

GMEU: No objections

GMP: Design for Security: The parking and amenity areas around the blocks should be enclosed by 2.1m high boundaries and entry must be controlled by automatically operated gates. The Warwick Road South boundary should be defined using low walls/railings and cycle/bin stores should not provide climbing aids over the site boundaries.

United Utilities: No objections subject to standard conditions and informatives being added to any permission.

Electricity North West: Any comments received will be included within the Additional Information Report.

Drainage: Peak discharge rates should comply with the limits indicated in the Level 2 Hybrid SFRA for Trafford/Manchester/Salford.

REPRESENTATIONS

Two letters of support for the development have been received from local residents, indicating that the proposals will clean up the current eyesore that currently occupies the site and which has been subjected to fly-tipping for a number of years.

Two letters of objection have also been submitted by local residents. These express concern with the high density of development; the extra traffic on already busy roads that it will generate; and the amount of noise and dirt on the roads that will result from the construction process.

A further letter from a resident on Warwick Court states that the new boundary wall between the site and properties on Warwick Court should be increased in height to improve security.

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

1. Although presently vacant, the site provides an (industrial) employment use that could potentially be resurrected in the future. As such the demolition of the existing buildings on the site, and subsequent loss of employment land, should be assessed against the relevant tests set out within Policy W1.12 of the Trafford Core Strategy.

2. The applicant explains within their Employment Statement that the existing industrial buildings have stood vacant for a number of years and, at 0.37ha in size, the site represents only 0.13% of the available supply of Employment Land (as identified within the Council's 2010 Employment Land Study). Attention has also been drawn to the other permissions for residential development that have recently been secured on this site; that the surrounding area is now largely residential in character; and that the site has been subjected to fly-tipping and anti-social behaviour.
3. The poor condition of the industrial buildings, and their residential context, is recognised. Consequently it is considered that the prospect of them being reoccupied in the future for employment purposes is low, particularly given the offer available in nearby Trafford Park. The history of crime and anti-social behaviour is also acknowledged and the site generally is considered to be a significant eyesore, particularly for the existing residents on the opposite side of Warwick Road South. The redevelopment of this land for residential purposes would serve to resolve these longstanding issues.
4. Policies L1 and L2 of the Trafford Core Strategy advocate the use of brownfield land for development, and the provision of affordable housing to meet the identified needs of the Borough. It also requires new housing to be located in sustainable locations. This scheme will make use of derelict, brownfield land and comprises of solely affordable housing, split equally between one and two bedroom units. The applicant's affordable housing statement confirms that the proposals are intended to provide for an increasing demand for smaller affordable households, which will in turn relieve the pressure on demand for larger family housing within the Borough by freeing up smaller household occupiers from this form of housing. The site itself is located close to a selection of day-to-day top-up amenities that are available at the Quadrant Neighbourhood Centre (250m to the south-west), as well as good bus links along Kings Road and the Old Trafford metrolink stop (150m north). Longford Park, 350m to the south-west, represents the closest area of green-space. As such it can be concluded that the development would be situated in a highly sustainable location.
5. In addition to the above, it is considered that the development will contribute towards meeting other strategic and local objectives within the Core Strategy; in particular Stretford Place Objectives STO1 & STO2 which seek to establish a better balance in housing types and tenure in the area, and maximize opportunities for the re-use or redevelopment of unused or derelict land for housing.
6. Overall the existing industrial buildings are considered to be unsuitable for reoccupation for industrial purposes, and as such their loss is acceptable. Their replacement with a residential development comprising of solely affordable housing will serve to meet an identified housing need within Stretford and provides the opportunity to reduce incidents of anti-social behaviour in the area and visually improve the Warwick Road South streetscene. Therefore it is considered to be compliant with Policies L1, L2 and W1 of the Trafford Core Strategy. A further assessment shall now be made against the various tests identified within Policy L7 – Design, of the Core Strategy.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

7. The proposed development comprises of three distinct apartment blocks, arranged in a linear fashion along Warwick Road South. Within each building a central corridor on each floor serves two rows of (generally) single-aspect apartments. The western elevations of the development, which front the highway, would retain a minimum distance of 25m to the facing properties on the opposite side of Warwick Road South. A distance of 19m would remain to the nearest private garden areas (35 and 40 Wilton Avenue). These separations comply with the privacy guidelines set out for three-storey development in the Council's SPG: New Residential Development.
8. The remaining apartments face towards the east, across to the rear boundary of the site. For the northernmost block residents will benefit from an outlook over a series of allotments, however the remaining two buildings would look towards the curtilage of 25 or 28 Warwick Court. The Council's privacy guidelines require that new habitable room windows retain a minimum of 10.5m and 13.5m, at first and second-floor levels respectively, to a neighbour's private garden. Elements of the central and southernmost block retain just 12.2m to the Warwick Court gardens, which falls short of the standards for second-floor windows. To address this issue the applicant has proposed to install obscured-glazing to secondary or non-habitable room windows and, for primary habitable room windows, to install projecting angled windows that include a panel of obscured-glazing on one side, and a clear-glazed outlook on the other side that channels views away from private garden areas. It is acknowledged that the development will result in the formation of several windows on the elevations facing No.25 and No.28 however, subject to the proposed obscure-glazed panes being appropriately located, it is considered that they will not be unduly overlooked and great weight is attached to the fact that a nuisance site for these neighbours will be cleared. Currently these Warwick Court gardens are enclosed and severely overshadowed by a series of 9m high industrial buildings and therefore it is considered that the development will improve the overall level of amenity enjoyed by residents of No.25 and No.28.
9. A number of secondary windows have been proposed on the side elevations to each of the apartment blocks, which consequently results in a degree of interlooking within the development. The resulting separation between these windows is typically 12m, across a slight angle, a distance that would normally be unacceptable if it applied to facing habitable rooms, or affected an existing neighbour, but which is considered to be reasonable in this instance given the small size of the windows in question and that they are situated on a side elevation.
10. Two of the rear-facing apartments on the second-floor of Block 2 include a primary bedroom window on the return, side elevation that looks directly onto the angled windows of neighbouring apartments over a very short distance. Details submitted by the applicant as part of an obscure-glazing condition will ensure that prospective residents of these particular units do not experience a loss of privacy as a result of this relationship.

11. The development provides an area of soft amenity space, 215sqm in size, to the rear of Block 2 that will be available to all residents. This provision falls significantly short of the 18sqm per apartment recommended within the Council's SPG: New Residential Development. Almost half (28) of the proposed units will benefit from their own external balcony area, which the SPG states can be considered as private amenity space for apartment blocks. It is also recognised that a 'Borough Park' in the form of Longford Park is located 350m away to the south, and therefore residents will have easy access to an area of green-space of district-wide significance. Finally, weight is also attached to the overall need to replace the unsightly buildings that occupy this derelict site with a viable development, and one that will provide a significant number of affordable housing units. Given the above, the level of amenity space associated with the development is, in this instance, considered to be acceptable.

LAYOUT, SCALE, DESIGN AND STREETSCENE

12. A variety of building styles are evident along this section of Warwick Road South. On either side of the application site are flat-roofed developments of brown brick construction. The opposite side of the road comprises of inter-war semis and local authority housing dating from the 1970s, all of which is two-storey in height. Within the application site is a series of flat-roofed industrial sheds that range from being single-storey up to what could be considered typical for a three-storey building. The previous outline approval on this site (ref: 79462/O/2012) did not include consent for scale, however the indicative elevations that were submitted with the application showed aspects of the development extending up to three-storeys with a pitched roof above.
13. The proposed development is of comparable height to the existing industrial buildings, albeit they have been sited closer to the highway. A continuous sprawl of built form would no longer be presented towards the facing houses though, with the development separated out into three distinct blocks of uniform height. Importantly the proposals will result in a significant visual improvement over the current derelict sheds.
14. Apartment Blocks 1 and 3 have both been sited very close to their respective side boundaries. The latter building retains approximately 500mm to the south-eastern site edge. This aspect of the development will be separated from the adjacent garage/car wash building by an access track that leads to an electricity sub-station behind the site. As such a reasonable degree of visual separation will remain to the side of Block 3. To the north-west, Block 1 will retain a distance of 650mm to the adjoining site. Currently one of the existing industrial units extends right up to this boundary, albeit it is set back into the plot by 13m and behind the building line set by the adjacent Printer's. Nevertheless it is difficult to identify the boundary between the two sites at present, due to the proximity, alignment and matching material palette of the existing buildings here. In contrast, the new development will step forward of its neighbour, which is appropriate given that its appearance represents a significant visual improvement to the streetscene. Therefore, given the massing, siting and derelict nature of the building that it replaces, the location of this aspect of the development is considered, on balance, to be acceptable.

15. Although this section of Warwick Road South is predominantly residential in character, there are no other apartment blocks for this development to refer to in its design. The inter-war semis on the opposite side of the highway are attractive in their modesty but represent a very different form of development to that proposed here; therefore it is considered appropriate for an individual design approach to be adopted for the scheme. Red brick has been identified by the applicant as the primary external material for the buildings, which is welcomed. The units have been spread across three buildings, with the middle block presenting a frontage that is almost twice the length of its neighbours. The principal elevations have been adequately broken up by stepping elements of them forward and back at regular intervals. This approach, combined with the use of a contrasting brick at ground-floor level, creates a series of proportions on the upper-floors that are consistent with those of the facing semi-detached houses on the opposite side of the road. Following amendments the fenestration is now a more uniform in size and has been recessed into the brickwork, whilst a more even arrangement of external balconies has also been secured. This serves to create a consistent level of articulation, and rhythm of features along the front elevations. A projecting porch feature denotes the point of shared access for residents and visitors, although some of the units also benefit from their own entrances direct from Warwick Road South which, it is hoped, will create a more active frontage and an enhanced sense of ownership. The generous separation between the blocks means that their side elevations will be clearly visible within the streetscene. Adequate visual interest has been applied to them through the inclusion of secondary windows, and recessed areas of brickwork. Overall the design of the development is considered to be acceptable, and represents a substantial improvement over the appearance of the existing derelict site.
16. Although each of the new buildings sits relatively close to the highway, the amended site plan shows that they would sit behind a soft landscaped frontage, which includes some tree planting within the site. A set of 1.2m railings would define the front boundary, which creates an area of defensible space in-front of the front windows to the ground-floor properties whilst also maintaining a good degree of permeability. Car parking has been set behind the building line which is considered to be an appropriate approach.

LANDSCAPING

17. The majority of the application site is occupied by the building footprints and car parking, although the applicants have sought to soften the parking areas up by proposing to use 'grasscrete' surfacing instead of hardstanding. This approach is welcomed as it is considered that covering the rear portion of the site in concrete would have created a cold and harsh setting for this residential development. In the event this area will be further 'greened up' through the introduction of a living wall along the length of the rear boundary. Again this measure is supported and should be conditioned. The area of soft amenity space that is to be provided will comprise of a grassed area with tree planting, whilst planted borders have been shown around the rear edges of the three buildings. Outside of the site the applicant has agreed to plant a series of saplings within the Warwick Road South footpath, similar to those already in place outside of St. Hilda's Church, which will help to provide a softer setting for the development. Overall, subject to the delivery

of the above measures, it is considered that the site will be adequately landscaped.

CRIME PREVENTION

18. At the request of Design for Security (Greater Manchester police), the applicants have incorporated a set of electronic access gates at each of the site entrances, comprising of separate entrances for vehicles and pedestrians. This measure should serve to secure the parking and amenity areas and, along with the low railings along the Warwick Road South frontage, serves to clearly define the public and private spaces.
19. The rear (eastern) boundary to the site, including the section adjacent to 28 Warwick Court's rear garden, is set to comprise of a 3m high 'green' wall. Whilst this is a taller treatment than would normally be allowed next to a residential property, the security and acoustic benefits associated with it are recognised, and it represents a significant reduction in the scale of development that currently sits on this boundary, i.e. a 9m high warehouse building. The side boundaries, and the gaps between them and Blocks 1 and 3, should be secured with treatments that measure 2.1m in height. The design of the external bin stores should not assist anybody looking to climb over the rear wall. These are matters that can be adequately secured by condition.

ACCESS AND CAR PARKING

20. The Council's Car Parking Standards indicate that 90 parking spaces should normally be associated with this development, based on a provision of one space for each one-bedroom unit, and two-spaces per two-bed property. These are recognised to be maximum parking standards. The applicants have provided 50 parking spaces within the demise of the site, and have submitted supporting statements and survey work that seeks to justify this level of parking provision. These explain that the site is situated in a highly sustainable location; that the average number of cars owned by households in this part of the Borough is 0.98; and that the level of parking proposed is comparable to that provided by other affordable housing developments in the north of the Borough. Further to this latter point, the applicant states that the car parks serving these comparison affordable housing schemes are rarely occupied close to capacity, with a typical demand of 0.5-0.6 spaces per residential unit observed. The proposed car parking ratio for the Warwick Road South development is 0.83 spaces per unit.
21. The LHA has reviewed the applicant's supporting information, which includes a Transport Statement, and agree that the site is well located in relation to accessibility to local services, which includes the Metrolink line and local bus routes. However whilst this might lead to a reduction in typical car usage by residents, there is little evidence to show that it actually results in a reduction of typical car ownership levels, and it is these that are the main determinant for car parking demand within residential developments.
22. The submitted TS does also consider car ownership levels in the area and makes reference to recent census data for Longford Ward. On the basis of this the LHA

has concluded that, accounting for growth in ownership up to 2020, residents of this development could be expected to have access to a total of 65 cars and as such there is some justification for a reduction in the normally expected level of car parking at the site. These figures would suggest a demand from 15 residents for on-street parking spaces, plus any additional visitors looking to park close to the site.

23. The recent survey of car parking at other fully-occupied affordable housing schemes indicates that the level of parking demand during the peak evening period is likely to be lower than the average for other dwellings of this size in the Borough. An amended site plan demonstrates that there would be scope for up to 11 cars to park safely outside the site along the Warwick Road South highway. Although the street is already heavily used for parking, principally due to its proximity to the Metrolink Station and Ayres Road Mosque, this tends to be during the daytime working hours. The peak period for any on-street car parking generated by this residential development will generally be in the evening, when Metrolink parking is at a low level. Therefore, given all of the above, it is likely that the availability of on-street parking immediately outside of the site will be sufficient to accommodate any demands for resident/visitor parking generated by the development in excess of the 50 marked bays provided. On this basis the LHA has confirmed that there are no objections to the parking levels associated with the development.
24. The transport statement demonstrates that the traffic volumes generated by the development will be modest and will, overall, be lower than the previous industrial use.
25. The submitted proposals include the construction of footway build-outs adjacent to the proposed access points into the application site. The LHA has welcomed these works but considers that they should be funded by the developer as part of a s278 agreement, which can be secured by condition and entered into once planning permission has been issued. The same mechanism should be used to obtain the provision of Traffic Regulation Orders (in the form of double yellow lines) around the kerb of the footway build-outs to safeguard a reasonable visibility splay for vehicles that are leaving the site.
26. The electronic access gates have been set within the site to prevent cars from blocking the footway when waiting for them to open, although this has resulted in some of the parking spaces falling outside of the secure area. It is recommended that the applicant submit a scheme for installing retractable bollards to these spaces to prevent them from becoming occupied by non-residents searching for commuter or match-day car parking.

FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS

27. This proposal is subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and comes under the category of 'apartments' and consequently 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).

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. In order to secure this, a landscaping condition will be attached to make specific reference to the need to provide additional trees on site as part of the landscaping proposals.

CONCLUSION

29. In conclusion, the proposed development would deliver 60 units of affordable housing that are designed to meet an identified need within this part of the Borough. The redevelopment will result in the removal of the overbearing and unsightly buildings that currently occupy the site, along with the issues around anti-social behaviour and fly-tipping that are also associated with them. The replacement buildings will not unduly harm the levels of privacy that existing and future occupiers could reasonably expect to enjoy, and their design and scale is considered to have an acceptable impact on the streetscene. The level of off-street car parking provided is considered to be sufficient for a development of this size and use and therefore, on the basis of the above, the scheme is compliant with all relevant Policies set out in the Trafford Core Strategy, and the Council's SPG: New Residential Development.


RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard;
2. Compliance with all Plans;
3. Affordable Housing;
4. Materials;
5. Landscaping (to include installation of grasscrete surfacing and living wall);
6. Detailed scheme for tree-planting within the footpath and implementation;
7. Obscured-glazing;
8. Windows on the SE side of Block 3 to be un-openable and fitted with acoustic trickle vent;
9. Details of boundary treatments and electronic access gates;
10. Provision and retention of parking spaces;
11. Drainage, to include discharge storm water at a peak rate that accords with the limits set out within the Manchester City, Salford and Trafford Level 2 SFRA;
12. Prior to the commencement of any works (demolition), a Construction Management Plan (CMP), to include details regarding working hours, dust suppression, and wheel wash, shall be submitted to and approved by the LPA. The CMP shall include details regarding dust and noise prevention and wheel washing for vehicles leaving the site.
13. Design and details of cycle parking and bin storage;
14. Glazing within windows to be recessed by 70mm;
15. Building out of highway and TRO's on Warwick Road South;
16. Installation of retractable bollards to those spaces provided within the site but outside of the secure access gates;
17. Contaminated Land;

JK



Former Trafford Metal Finishers, Warwick Road South, 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 14/05/2015
Date	30/04/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

WARD: Brooklands

84827/HHA/15

DEPARTURE: No

Erection of roof extension to form first floor accommodation, involving 1.4m increase in height.

Breydon, Aylwin Drive, Sale, M33 3WG

APPLICANT: Mr Cornish

AGENT: n/a

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

The application has been called in by Councillor Dixon on the basis that the proposal would result in an invasion of privacy, and is out of keeping in the area.

SITE

The application relates to a detached bungalow to the south east of Aylwin Drive in Sale. Aylwin Drive is a single vehicle access which serves two bungalows at the rear of properties to the south of Marsland Road. Both bungalows are angled within their plots, with Breydon facing north west. The property benefits from a single storey side extension, and a contemporary full height rear extension forming an open plan living area on the ground floor with double height windows on the rear and side elevations that maximise natural light into the dwelling.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a roof extension to form first floor accommodation within the original bungalow. The proposal would increase the ridge height of the dwelling by 1.4m; the eaves would remain as existing. Full height windows would be introduced into the side gables, which would include timber fins, which were introduced to prevent overlooking, following neighbour objections and to adhere to the Council's guidance. Obscure glazing would be introduced to the apex above the finned windows on the side elevations.

The proposal originally sought to introduce a roof terrace to the south west side of the property; this has now been removed.

The increase in floor space of the proposed development would be 55 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

L4 – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility

L5 – Climate Change

L7 – Design

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

None

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

None relevant

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

78999/HHA/2012 – Erection of fence and gates to front boundary (maximum height 1510mm) and erection of porch to front elevation of dwelling. Approved with conditions: 29/09/2011.

76935/HHA/2011 – Erection of full height extension to rear of bungalow and erection of front porch. External alterations to dwelling and erection of outbuilding to north eastern corner of site, all to form additional living accommodation. Approved with conditions: 27/07/2011.

H38055 – Erection of single storey side extension to form bedroom with en-suite bathroom. Approved with conditions: 30/11/1993.

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has responded to neighbour representations, addressing the following:

- Regarding the existing extension, the applicant states that the extension already has been widely praised from Dezeen, the Wall Street Journal, and Grand Design magazine, as well as being shortlisted for the regional RIBA Awards 2014. This goes to demonstrate that design is a matter of taste, and that the proposal will be of the highest quality and innovative. The designs reinvent and modernise the perception of bungalows being for elderly people.
- In response to the impact in terms of scale, proportion and invasion of privacy, the applicant contends that the site coverage of the bungalow including the existing extension would be 1,650sq ft – the proposal would not extend the footprint, which represents 15% site coverage. The proposed new roof reflects the roofline at Aylwin, and will be lower than all other surrounding properties. The property will therefore remain lower and less dense than surrounding properties and should not be considered as overdevelopment.
- The applicant argues that increasing the height of the roof should not be considered as out of character; given the existing extension, it is in character with its immediate surroundings.
- The applicant believes that the concerns regarding the roof terrace, and all other issues have been addressed through the amended plans.

CONSULTATIONS

GMEU – Advised that an emergence survey should be submitted prior to determination.

REPRESENTATIONS

6 letters of objection were received from nos 4 and 6 Mowbray Avenue, nos 151, 157 and 159 Marsland Road, and Aylwin, Aylwin Drive, summarised as follows:

- Unacceptable invasion of privacy, as the proposal would directly overlook neighbouring garden areas;
- Increasing the size of the house would reduce the amount of light into neighbouring gardens;
- Should the proposal be granted would request that there should be permanent natural screening to be erected in order to retain privacy and reduce inconvenience caused by development as it is built;
- There has already been one extensive development that has negatively affected surrounding properties, as it is unsightly and unconventional;
- Scale of the proposal, in addition to the existing extension would be an over-development of the property.
- The inclusion of an open roof terrace would directly overlook the sitting room to Aylwin, an upstairs bedroom, and garden area. The roof terrace would also have visual and aural impacts; the house enjoys a sizeable garden, the roof terrace is not necessary;

- The Council has responsibilities under the Human Rights Act, in particular Protocol 1, Article 1, and Article 8 that state that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, and the substantive right to respect for their private family life.

Following the amended plans, 1 objection was withdrawn from Aylwin, Aylwin Drive on the basis that windows are conditioned to be obscurely glazed and the privacy fins to be installed and retained.

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;
 - 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 proposed development would create first floor accommodation to form two additional bedrooms, one with an en-suite, and two further bathrooms. The proposal would involve raising the roof by 1.4m, giving the property an overall height of 6.8m. The proposed development would include roof lights on the front and rear elevations, with full length windows on the side gables. The existing rear extension would remain unchanged.
3. Aylwin Drive is a single vehicle access drive serving the application property and one other bungalow. The other property Aylwin has first floor accommodation to a similar extent of that proposed. Given the private nature of Aylwin Drive, and the neighbouring property, it is therefore considered that the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the streetscene, and would not appear out of character with the dwelling or surrounding area.
4. Objections have been raised on the basis that the proposal would be an overdevelopment of the site, and the 'unsightly' nature of the existing extension.
5. The existing extension has already been approved, and therefore does not form part of the proposal to be considered in the current application. However, it is considered by increasing the height of the original part of the dwellinghouse, the proposed extension would balance out the appearance of the existing extension, which would appear less dominant, and more subordinate as a result of the proposal.
6. The proposed development would create first floor accommodation above the main dwelling; and would therefore not increase the overall footprint of the property. This type of development is not uncommon for extensions to bungalows. Taking into

consideration the cumulative impact of the current application and the previous extensions, it is not considered that it would be an overdevelopment, as the eaves height would remain as existing, with development contained within the roofspace, therefore ensuring that the overall character of the property would remain unchanged. The proposal achieves an extension to the roof without the need for dormer windows, and does not dominate through excessive size or prominent siting, in accordance with SPD4 guidelines.

7. The current application, in context with the previously approved contemporary rear extension demonstrates a high quality design and clear design process, in accordance with the Council's Policy L7 and the NPPF, in which one of the core planning principles is to *'always seek to secure high quality design and good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings'*. It is therefore considered that the proposed development is acceptable in terms of design and appearance.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

8. In relation to residential amenity, Policy L7 of the Core Strategy states development must not prejudice the amenity of the occupants of adjacent properties by reason of being overbearing, overshadowing, overlooking or visual intrusion.
9. SPD4 sets out detailed guidance for protecting neighbouring amenity (paras 2.14 to 2.18) as well as under the relevant sections for particular types of development.
10. Residential properties bound the application site to the north, south, east and west. The application originally proposed to introduce a roof terrace to the south west; this element of the proposal has subsequently been removed.
11. The proposal would introduce first floor windows on the side elevations, and rooflight windows on the front and rear. The first floor window on the north eastern elevation would serve a bedroom, and would be located 7m from 159 Marsland Road, at its closest point, and 12m from no. 157 at the closest point. The proposed plans have been amended to introduce a series of timber 'privacy fins' that would be angled to 45° and set apart by approx. 0.35m. The angle and intervals of the fins would therefore prevent any overlooking to the neighbouring gardens. The windows would be 1.8m in height, above which the gable apex would have obscure glazing, to further ensure there would be no overlooking as a result of this element of the proposal.
12. Similarly, the proposal would introduce full length windows on the south western elevation serving an ensuite bathroom. The windows on this elevation would be obscurely glazed and introduce 1.8m high timber 'privacy fins, approx. 0.4m apart at an angle of 90°; the windows would also have restricted opening mechanisms. Further obscure glazing would be introduced above the full length windows to the gable apex.

13. The proposed en-suite bathroom would also have a frosted glass screen to the front elevation to ensure there would be no overlooking from this aspect.
14. The proposed development would increase the height of the dwelling by 1.4m; however the property would maintain a relatively low profile, and is not considered to cause any harm to neighbouring amenity in this respect. Furthermore, the neighbouring properties are located at a sufficient distance from the application property so as not to appear overbearing. The closest property Aylwin is angled away from Breydon, and it is therefore not considered that the proposed development would have any overbearing impact, or result in a loss of light to the occupants of this neighbouring dwelling.
15. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable detrimental impact to the occupiers of surrounding properties in terms of loss of light, loss of privacy or being overbearing in accordance with policy L7 of the adopted Core Strategy and the relevant paragraphs contained within the SPD4.

PARKING

16. The proposed development would increase the number of bedrooms from 4 to 6. The application site has off street parking to accommodate 4 vehicles, as shown in the submitted parking plan. This is considered acceptable, in accordance with guidance contained within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Standards and Design, which suggests that properties with 4 or more bedrooms should provide off street parking for 3 cars.

BATS

17. A Bat Scoping Survey was submitted alongside the application. The consultation response recommended that despite finding no evidence of bats, one dusk emergence survey should be submitted prior to determination, given the proximity of a known bat roost at 163 Marsland Road.
18. At the time of writing this report, a bat survey has been commissioned and it is intended that the results of this will be reported further in an Additional Information Report.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

19. No planning obligations are required.

CONCLUSION

20. In conclusion, it is considered that the proposed development would complete a high quality modern redevelopment of the existing bungalow, whilst maintaining a

low profile that is acceptable in terms of design and impact on the streetscene. The proposal is not considered to result in any undue harm to the surrounding residential dwellings, in terms of loss of light, loss of privacy and overbearing impact. The proposal is considered to be in compliance with the relevant Trafford Core Strategy Policies, and the relevant sections of the NPPF; accordingly the proposal is recommended for approval.


RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions

1. Standard
2. Amended plans
3. Materials – to be submitted
4. Details to the privacy fins to be submitted, and to be installed and retained thereafter
5. Parking – retention of parking in accordance with submitted plan
6. Obscure glazing condition, with restricted opening mechanisms as shown on the plans
7. Bats – compliance with GMEU advice

OSt-A



Breydon, Aylwin Drive, 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 14/05/2015
Date	30/04/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

WARD: Flixton

84883/FUL/15

DEPARTURE: No

Change of use from a place of worship (Use Class D1) to residential (Use Class C3) to create 5 no. apartments with associated car parking, cycle storage, boundary treatment and bin store. Internal and external works to the building to include: - changes to windows, addition of windows, rooflights, new bay window, dormer window, hip to gable extension and external railings.

Victoria Gospel Hall, 119 Church Road, Flixton, M41 9ET

APPLICANT: Holmwood Enterprises

AGENT: Foxley Tagg Planning Ltd

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

SITE

The application site occupies a corner plot to the south east of Church Road at its junction with Barnfield, which lies adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. The site comprises of a detached two storey period property known as Victoria Gospel Hall, which was formerly used as a place of worship but has been vacant since May 2011. There is a pedestrian access from Church Road to the front of the property and a vehicular access to the rear of the property, which has been gravelled to provide a parking area. There are a number of mature trees within the site adjacent to the front and side boundaries with Church Road and Barnfield and the front garden of the property is significantly well stocked. The front boundary is a low height stone wall extending towards the Barnfield frontage, with 1m high vehicular access gates and a low height picket style fence forming the rear part of the side boundary.

An electricity substation lies to the south of the site off Barnfield, beyond which lies a detached residential dwelling at No.2 Barnfield. To the south west of the site is a similar two storey detached property No.121 Church Road, which benefits from a single storey extension to the rear adjacent to the common boundary with the application site that extends the full length of the rear garden. On the opposite side of Church Road, a terraced row of two storey properties form the local shopping area at street level.

PROPOSAL

It is proposed to change the use of the property from a place of worship (Use Class D1) to 5 x residential apartments (Use Class C3).

The proposed accommodation comprises as follows:

Ground Floor

1no. 1 bedroom apartment
1no. 2 bedroom apartment

First Floor

1no. 2 bedroom apartment
1no. 1 bedroom apartment

Second Floor Level

1no. 2 bedroom apartment

It is proposed to undertake external alterations to the property. These include the insertion of rooflights at main roof level, a hip to gable roof extension, provision of a new dormer window at main roof level, insertion of a new window at second floor level on the front and rear elevations and the addition of a bay window at first floor level above the existing ground floor level bay.

Associated parking is proposed to the rear of the property and it is proposed to provide bin and cycle storage facilities.

The application has been amended since initial submission. The applicant has reduced the size of the dormer window on the rear elevation and replaced proposed Juliet balcony and doors at second floor level with a new window. The proposed parking layout has been revised to include an additional parking space and the proposed bin storage has been reduced in height to ensure visibility for cars leaving the site. Also following comments from the Council's Arboriculture Officer the proposed tree protection measures have been amended accordingly.

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
R3 – Green Infrastructure
R2 – Natural Environment
W1 – Economy
W2 – Town Centres and Retail

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

Unallocated

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

83594/FULL/2014 - Change of use from a place of worship (Use Class D1) to residential (Use Class C3) and office use (Use Class B1a) to create 4 no. apartments and an office with associated car parking, cycle sheds, bin store and benches. Internal and external works to the building to include: - changes to windows, addition of Juliet balcony, rooflights, new bay window, dormer windows and external railings. Approved 13th October 2014

78728/COU/2012 - Change of use of building from place of worship (Use Class D1) to single residential dwelling with 5 no. bedrooms (Use Class C3). Approved 5th August 2013

Pre Application

Pre application advice was received by the applicant from the LPA on 20/12/2013. The pre application advice was for the proposed use of the site as 5 x residential apartments. The response supported the principle of the change of use of the property to five residential flats however amendments were suggested to the external works proposed to preserve residential amenity and ensure adequate parking and access facilities.

CONSULTATIONS

Local Highway Authority: No objections. The proposal complies with standards in terms of cycle parking, layout and standard of access. An additional parking space near the bin store on the site would be acceptable given in reality manoeuvring accidents within car parks are extremely rare and unless some physical measures are taken to prevent car access, it is likely to be used as a space if needed, whether or not it is formally allocated. Therefore in practical terms the development should probably be considered to be a single space short of standards and in light of the existing D1 use being heavily below standard in terms of parking it is considered 1 space short of the standards (subject to an amended plan) could be supported in this case, on balance.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit: No objections, subject to conditions.

Pollution and Licensing: No objections.

Tree Officer: No objections, subject to conditions. Proposed planting schedule acceptable and amended tree protection measures supported.

Electricity North West: No objections. The development is shown to be adjacent to or affecting ENW operation land or electricity distribution assets. Applicant must ensure development doesn't encroach over either land or any ancillary right. Applicant advised great care should be taken to protect both the electrical apparatus and any personnel working in its vicinity.

United Utilities: None received. Any comments received will be included within the Additional Information Report.

REPRESENTATIONS

Six letters of objection have been received from neighbouring properties. The concerns raised are as follows:

- The property is old and there could be the risk of asbestos
- The proposal will result in unacceptable levels of on street parking
- The proposal does not provide sufficient parking spaces. Barnfield is already heavily congested with on street parking and the proposal will only exacerbate this situation
- The proposal would result in a pedestrian safety issue as parked cars on the pavements as a result of the proposal would put pedestrians at risk

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

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. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF advises that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
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. Policy L1 of the Trafford Core Strategy states that the Council will seek to deliver 12,210 new dwellings up to 2026 through new-build, conversion and sub-division, primarily in sustainable locations. An indicative target of 80% of new housing provision in the Borough shall utilise brownfield land and buildings. The application proposes the change of use of a vacant building to five residential dwellings within the urban area, which is a sustainable form of development that would contribute to the delivery of housing within the Borough.
4. As the proposal includes 2 no. 1 bed apartments, Policy L2.7 of the Adopted Core Strategy should be applied. 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. In all circumstances, the delivery of such accommodation will need to be specifically justified in terms of a clearly identified need.
5. The applicant has submitted a statement in order to demonstrate the need for 1 bed units in the Urmston area. The applicant has stated that the scale of the development will be able to support key workers. The site has good transportation links to the Regional Centre and major employers such as the BBC. The applicant considers that the development is ideally placed to cater for professionals working in the wider area. The site is within walking distance of Trafford District General Hospital which creates an interesting sub rental market in the Urmston area. The site is located 1km from 2 stations and is within close proximity of Urmston Town Centre.
6. Taking the above points into account, although part of the proposal will include 2 no. 1 bed units, it is considered that the proposal will make a positive contribution to the housing land target as set out in Policy L1.2. Additionally, the application site is located within a sustainable location on the edge of Church Road/Chassen Road junction Local Centre, the site is within walking distance of Urmston Town Centre and is close to public transport links such as Urmston and Chassen Road stations.
7. Policy L2 of the Trafford Core Strategy requires that all new development shall be on a site of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed use and all necessary ancillary facilities for residents and shall be appropriately located in

terms of access to existing community facilities. The application site lies within the urban area opposite a local shopping parade and the site is of sufficient size to accommodate a private communal garden area and parking for future residents.

8. The proposal is considered to be acceptable, in accordance with the NPPF and the Core Strategy providing additional residential accommodation thereby contributing towards meeting the housing needs of the Borough.

DESIGN AND APPEARANCE

9. The building is a detached two storey period property with attractive traditional features. It is proposed to insert rooflights in the north, east and south roofslopes of the property and a dormer window to the rear (south) roofslopes. On the western elevation it is proposed to extend at roof level with a hip to gable extension. These works along with the insertion of a window to the front gable and second storey window above this and a new window to the rear gable would facilitate the use of the second floor level of the property as a residential flat. At the front of the property it is proposed to construct a bay window at first floor level above the existing ground floor level bay. At ground floor level to the western side elevation it is proposed to install new traditional metal railings and brick up two existing windows.
10. The proposed external alterations are considered to be modest in nature and would be in keeping with the traditional style and scale of the property; complementing the appearance of the building. The proposal is considered to comply with CS Policy L7.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

11. The boundaries of the site are enclosed by 121 Church Road to the west, an electrical substation to the south, beyond which lies 2 Barnfield and the side and front elevation front Barnfield and Church Road.
12. The proposed conversion of the property to 5 x residential units would result in a greater intensification of the use of the building. However as the current use of the site is D1 use class and it was used as a place of worship, the proposed residential conversion to 5 x residential apartments would not be considered to be an over intensification of the site. The proposal would result in greater use of the upper floors, however as the existing D1 use class utilises the upper floors and the property is detached, this is not considered to result in an undue noise and disturbance impact to the neighbouring property. Nevertheless the control of noise and disturbance within the building would be subject to Building Control regulations.

13. The proposed windows in the rear elevation at first and second floor level would not adversely overlook the neighbouring property at Number 2 Barnfield given the distance from the boundary and the adjacent substation. The proposed side window in the gable extension facing 121 Church Road would feature obscure glazing and would be fixed shut to ensure there is no undue overlooking to the residents of No. 121 Church Road.
14. Useable amenity space would be provided in the form of a communal garden to the front of the property and the site is within walking distance to a number of public parks, including Urmston Meadows to the south of the site. With regard to the level of residential amenity future occupants of the proposed dwellings would enjoy, adequate light and outlook from habitable room windows would be provided. Therefore future occupants of the proposed dwellings would be provided with a satisfactory standard of living.

ACCESS, HIGHWAYS AND PARKING

15. Policy L4 of the Trafford Core Strategy 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.
16. The rear of the property is proposed to accommodate the off road parking provision for the future occupants of the dwellings. The Council's car parking requirements as contained in Core Strategy Policy L4 and SPD3: Parking Standards and Design requires 1 bedroom residential units to provide 1 car parking space and 2 bedroom units to provide 2 car parking spaces each.
17. The proposal includes the provision of 7 no. car parking spaces in total. This provision is one car parking space short of the maximum parking standards within SPD3. In light of the recently approved scheme at the site (ref: 83594/FULL/2014) which also provided one car parking space short of the maximum parking standards, this proposal is considered to be acceptable. Furthermore, in accordance with SPD3: Parking Standards and Design the existing use of the property as a worship hall (D1 use class) requires 1 space per 5sqm. Consequently the existing property, which has a total non-residential floor space of 235sqm, should provide 47 spaces. However at present the site provides space for a maximum of 6 cars to park off road at the site. The proposal would therefore result in an improvement on the existing parking provision at the site. Additionally the property is located in close proximity to two stations (Urmston and Chassen Road Stations) and within walking distance of Urmston Town Centre. Overall the proposal is not likely to result in a level of on-street parking that would warrant a refusal on these grounds.
18. The Local Highway Authority has assessed the proposal and the proposed car parking would meet the requirements in terms of 6m aisle width to allow for

manoeuvring and sufficient width to each car parking space. It is considered the addition of a space next to the bin stores would be acceptable given in reality manoeuvring accidents within car parks are extremely rare and unless some physical measures are taken to prevent car access, it is likely to be used as a space if needed, whether or not it is formally allocated. The vehicle access point at the rear has been increased in width to 4.5m and details of the boundary treatment have been submitted and the height of that proposed ensures visibility is maintained. Cycle storage is proposed in enclosed cycle stores located in the front garden close to the side boundary and is considered acceptable by the Local Highways Authority.

ECOLOGICAL IMPACT

19. The application property has a number of crevices suitable for roosting bats and consequently it is considered to have a low to moderate potential to host roosting bats.
20. In order to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an adverse impact upon bats, which are a European Protected Species, a bat survey has been submitted with the application.
21. The bat survey has been reviewed by the Greater Manchester Ecological Unit who has confirmed bats were found at the site and therefore a license will be required from Natural England to carry out development works. GMEU are satisfied a license would be issued given the low number of bats. Consequently, they have confirmed that they have no objections to the proposal on nature conservation and biodiversity grounds subject to the attachment of a condition requiring a license to be obtained from Natural England and submitted to and approved by the Council prior to commencement of development at the site.
22. Subject to the attachment of the condition recommended by GMEU it is considered that the proposal would not have any adverse impact upon any ecological interest.

PLANNING CONTRIBUTIONS

23. This proposal is subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and is located in the 'cold zone' for residential development; consequently the apartments will be liable to a CIL charge rate of £0 per square metre.

CONCLUSION

24. It is considered that the proposed development would be acceptable in policy terms and in terms of visual amenity, residential amenity, highway safety and parking provision and ecological impacts. It is therefore recommended that planning permission should be granted, subject to conditions.


RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions

1. Standard Time Limit
2. Compliance with Approved Plans
3. Materials
4. Landscaping
5. Tree Protection
6. Parking and vehicular access
7. Cycle parking
8. Bin storage
9. Boundary treatment
10. Obscure glazing to second storey window
11. Bat protection
12. Compliance with Bat Inspection and Assessment

LB



Victoria Gospel Hall, 119 Church 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 14/05/2015
Date	30/04/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

WARD: Stretford

84982/FUL/15

DEPARTURE: NO

Extension to western side of shopping centre (Unit 5A) to create new foodstore and subdivision of existing unit to create four kiosk units. Alterations to existing parking area and landscaping works

Unit 5A Stretford Mall Extension, Stretford Shopping Mall, Chester Road, Stretford, M32 9BA

APPLICANT: Lunar Stretford Sarl

AGENT: Pozzoni LLP

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

SITE

The proposed extension is to the western side of Stretford Mall. Stretford Mall was opened in 1969 and is one of the original Arndale Centres. This western side of the Mall faces onto the surface car park accessed from Kingsway. This extension was completed in 1989 and comprises 4 units of approximately 200 square metres and a larger unit of 940 square metres which was previously occupied by Wilkinson. All units are currently vacant.

The Mall is predominantly faced in brick with a glazed entrance to the Mall within the centre of the western elevation which provides pedestrian access from the surface level car park.

To the west and south of the proposed development are residential properties, mainly two storey terraces, on Barton Road, Wellington Street and Church Street. The nearest residential property to Stretford Mall lies approximately 35 metres from the southern or western corner of the site boundary. The existing surface level car park lies between the area of development and these residential properties. To the north and east of the proposed development are other commercial properties on Kingsway and Chester Road, either forming part of the wider Stretford Mall complex, or other town centre premises operating separately from Stretford Mall.

The existing access ramp to the multi storey car park of the shopping centre is to the immediate north of the location of the proposed extension. The proposed extension will be located on land which is currently used as a service area and customer parking area.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey extension to Unit 5A of Stretford Mall. The proposed extension will provide an additional 935 square metres of A1 retail floorspace to accommodate a 1,580 square metre Aldi food store, comprising 1,140 square metres of tradable floorspace, a warehouse and staff welfare facilities. The proposed foodstore will extend onto the existing surface car park and service area and therefore the scheme involves some remodelling works to

the internal road layout, customer parking, cycle provision and associated hard and soft landscaping works.

The foodstore will be accessed via a separate pedestrian entrance located to the southern elevation of the proposed unit. The proposed extension is a maximum height of 6.5 metres and includes a canopy to the southern and western elevations. The materials proposed for the elevations comprise red facing brick, sandstone feature banding, curtain wall glazing and greygoose cladding.

The proposal also includes the subdivision of the southern part of the existing Unit 5A to create four kiosk units which will be accessed from Stretford Mall.

Planning permission 79391/FULL/2012 was granted in April 2013 for a 1,260 square metre foodstore and four new kiosks with a combined floorspace of 400 square metres. The key differences between the proposed and approved applications are as follows:-

- A 1,580 square metre food store will be provided (increase of 320 square metres)
- Provision of kiosks with a combined floorspace of 291.3 square metres (decrease of 108.7 square metres)
- Realignment of northern elevation and the removal of an external access to the kiosks.
- The foodstore will be open until 22:00 Monday to Saturdays, rather than 21:00
- The number of parking spaces lost will increase from 48 to 55
- A larger area of public realm will be provided to the Mall entrance

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;
- 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; and

- 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

Policy L4 – Sustainable transport and accessibility

Policy L5 – Climate change

Policy L7 – Design

Policy L8 – Planning Obligations

Policy W1 – Economy

Policy W2 – Town centres and retail

Policy R2 – Natural Environment

Policy R3 – Green Infrastructure

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

Policy S8 – Development in Stretford Town Centre

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

Policy S8 – Development in Stretford Town Centre

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 within the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

79391/FULL/2012 - Extension to western side of shopping centre (Unit 5A) to create foodstore and subdivision of existing unit to create four kiosk units. Application approved with conditions 30.04.2013

H/62230 - Two storey extension to Stretford Mall to form:

1. Extension to Wilkinsons to form additional retail floorspace and staff accommodation at ground and first floor;
2. 4 no. new retail units at ground floor (each of A1, A2, A3 and A5);
3. B1 office space at first floor with access at ground level;
4. Extension to and amalgamation of units 67/68 to form new retail unit within Broady Street mall;
5. New glazed entrance to Broady Street mall;
6. Ancillary works to vehicular access/car parking.

Application approved with conditions 27.10.2005

H/26198 - Erection of extension to shopping centre (27,474 sq.ft), construction of additional surface level car parking and alteration to existing car parking and traffic circulation. Application approved with conditions 01.12.1987

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has submitted the following documents in support of the planning application:-

- Design and Access Statement
- Plans and drawings
- Transport Assessment

CONSULTATIONS

Local Highway Authority – No objections. Although car parking spaces are being lost there remain many unoccupied spaces within the site (mostly within the multi-storey car park) even at times of peak shopping demand. Even allowing for some increased parking demand created by the proposed additional retail floorspace it is considered that the parking provision on site is more than adequate.

Pollution & Licencing – No comments received to date.

Pollution – Contaminated Land – No objections subject to a condition for the submission of a Preliminary Risk Assessment and subsequent remediation works as necessary.

Lead Local Flood Authority – No objections subject to a condition to limit discharge rates in accordance with the Council's Level 2 Hybrid Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

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

REPRESENTATIONS

4 letters have been received as a consequence of the planning application publicity. 3 of the letters support the principle of development, however the following comments are made:-

- Request for high quality cycle parking
- Construction impacts including noise, disturbance and duration of build period
- Parking spaces within the multi storey car park cannot be safely and quickly accessed from the proposed store
- Concerns over materials and design
- The submission lacks details in terms of fencing, landscaping and pedestrian movement
- Highway safety concerns

- Delivery areas should be fenced off and secured
- Soft landscaping should comprise indigenous plant species

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

Strategic location

1. The site is located within Stretford Town Centre as defined on the Unitary Development Plan Proposals Map. Core Strategy Policy W2 identifies Stretford as a 'Town Centre' where development within these centres will, *"focus on the consolidation and improvement of the convenience and comparison retail offer, with the potential to strengthen and enhance the retail offer where suitable..."* Policy W2.6 indicates that the regeneration of the centre will be delivered through, *inter alia*, *"new / improved retail floorspace to enhance the offer of the town centre, in particular within Stretford Mall and immediate vicinity."* This policy approach is in full conformity with the approach set out within the Framework (NPPF), which states that, *"Local Planning Authorities should plan positively for their future to encourage economic activity"* (paragraph 23).
2. NPPF supports the proposed location of retail development within defined town centres and states that, *"significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system"* (paragraph 19). NPPF highlights the need to recognise town centres as the heart of communities and to support their viability and vitality. NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should, *"promote competitive town centres that provide customer choice and diverse retail offer"* (paragraph 23).
3. The site is located within a sustainable town centre location, and can be accessed by car, public transport, pedestrians and cyclists. The development would increase the likelihood of linked trips to the existing retail offer within the centre and would offer a sustainable way of meeting the retail needs of residents, whilst contributing towards maintaining and improving the vibrancy of the town centre. The development would represent a significant investment within a priority town centre location and would contribute towards the regeneration of Stretford Mall as a shopping and leisure destination in accordance with Core Strategy Strategic Objective SO4 and the Stretford Masterplan.

Brownfield land

4. NPPF paragraph 17 identifies a set of twelve core land use planning principles, of which bullet point 8) states that planning should *"encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value."* Core Strategy Strategic Objective SO7 seeks to secure sustainable development through promoting the reuse of resources. The proposed development site forms part of the existing car park and service areas for Stretford Mall and as

such constitutes previously developed land as defined in Annex 2 of the Framework. On this basis, it is considered that the development makes effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed, whilst protecting the need to release less sequentially preferable or greenfield sites.

Proposed uses - Supermarket and retail kiosks

5. The UDP Proposals Map indicates that the application site is located within Stretford Town Centre and as such is considered to be sequentially preferable site for future retail uses in accordance with Core Strategy policy W2 and the NPPF.
6. The proposed food store (including extension) will have a gross floor area of some 1,580 square metres with a tradable floor area of 1,140 square metres, whilst Unit 5A will be subdivided to create 4 kiosks which comprise a combined floor area of 291.3 square metres. Core Strategy policy W2.6 does not identify a quantum of additional retail floorspace to be provided within the Stretford Town Centre during the plan period. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that the scale of development is appropriate for a centre which is designated within the Core Strategy as an 'Other Town Centre'. It is noted that planning permission was recently granted (reference 79391/FULL/2012) for the provision of an additional 788 square metres retail floorspace to accommodate a 1,260 square metre (gross) food store. Although the proposed scheme will provide a slightly larger store than that currently approved, it is considered that the store is of a scale which is appropriate for this town centre location and would deliver the kind of Mall remodelling that is envisaged in the Stretford Masterplan.
7. Core Strategy Policy W2.11 indicates that developments within town centres should include a variety of unit sizes in order to encourage diversity in retail offer. The development will make provision for a medium scale food retailer and four smaller kiosk sized units all of which will attract different end users and will make a positive contribution towards the retail offer within Stretford Mall, whilst protecting the vitality and viability of the centre. The proposal is considered to be consistent with the above Core Strategy policies and place objectives for Stretford; in addition to the Stretford Masterplan and will enhance the opportunities for retail provision within the town centre.

DESIGN, LAYOUT, SCALE AND MASSING

8. The NPPF attaches "*great importance to the design of the built environment*" and indicates that, "*good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.*" 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.*" Core Strategy policy L7 reiterates these policy guidelines and states that high quality design is, "*a key element in making places better and delivering environmentally sustainable developments.*" The policy provides policy guidance in respect of design quality, functionality, amenity, security and accessibility.

9. The layout of the foodstore incorporates a single access and egress for customers and utilises the existing service arrangements which are accessed off Kingsway. The layout has been developed to accommodate the user requirements of the applicant (Aldi). The proposed extension would stand approximately 6 metres in height and would be single storey in nature. The scale of the proposed extension has a clear relationship to the existing Mall and ensures that the building, including the proposed extension is read as a coherent whole.
10. The building is set forward of the existing build line of the Mall, however the store entrance is located to the southern elevation and connects with the existing area of public realm to the Brody Street entrance. The proposed layout ensures that the store has a clear relationship with the Mall and provides a logical entrance for the foodstore.
11. Stretford Mall is architecturally representative of its time and comprises a palette of materials including glazed brickwork and concrete. The extension to the western end of the Mall, in which Unit 5a is located, is finished with red facing brick and a sandstone feature brick. The southern elevation of the proposed food store comprises a mix of curtain wall glazing and red facing brickwork. The choice of materials ensures that the building has a clear relationship to the mall, whilst the curtain wall glazing provides a clear focal point to shoppers accessing the store and contributes towards the creation of a more outward facing development in accordance with the Stretford Masterplan.
12. The internal layout of the food store is such that without the kiosks it would create a blank frontage internally along the Brody Street section of the Mall. However, the kiosks provide an active frontage within the Mall.
13. The western elevation of the extension is predominately comprised of curtain wall glazing, which presents an active frontage to the streetscene and also provides opportunities for natural surveillance across the public realm. A canopy is also provided which adds some architectural interest to the store. It is considered that these elevations respond positively to the context of the site and make a positive contribution towards the character of the area through appropriate remodelling of the Mall.
14. The northern and eastern elevations of the foodstore comprise a cladding system in Goosewing grey. These elevations are less interesting; however they are set behind the multi-storey car park ramp access; are set well back from the streetscene; or are only visible from the service yard. On this basis, and taking into consideration the internal configuration of the store, it is considered that these elevations are acceptable. A planning condition is proposed to secure appropriate facing materials.

DESIGN AND CRIME

15. NPPF paragraphs 58 and 69 indicate that planning decisions should aim to ensure that developments “*create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.*” Core Strategy policy L7.4 relates to matters of design and security and is supplemented by Supplementary Planning Guidance 24: Crime and Security. The policy states that development must be designed in a way that reduces opportunities for crime.
16. No Crime Impact Statement has been submitted in support of the application however, the typical security risks associated with a development of this type may include burglary, robbery, and general criminal damage. There are a variety of physical security measures and external design features available to the applicant that can be incorporated into the design of the scheme to ensure that a secure development is provided which incorporates opportunities to reduce crime. A planning condition is therefore recommended to ensure that appropriate external security measures are secured as part of the proposed foodstore scheme.

TRANSPORTATION, HIGHWAY SAFETY AND PARKING

Proposed layout, access and servicing arrangements

17. It is envisaged that customers using the foodstore will park in the surface level car park rather than the multi storey car park as direct access to the foodstore is provided from the surface level car park rather than from the Mall. The scheme proposes a number of minor amendments to the internal road layout of the surface level car park. In terms of servicing, this will be provided via the existing service yard which is accessed off Kingsway. The applicant has demonstrated that the service yard provides sufficient space to allow service vehicles to manoeuvre, enter and leave the site in a forward gear.

Parking

18. Policy L4.14 and Appendix 3 of the Core Strategy, supplemented by the Parking Standards and Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) identify the parking standards for a range of development types across the borough. The SPD identifies three accessibility areas which cover various parts of the Borough. Stretford is identified as being located within Area B and as such, the policy identifies a maximum requirement of 1 space per 15 square metres (Gross Floor Area) for A1 (food retail) developments. The development will deliver a 1580 square metre food store, comprising an additional 935 square metres of floorspace. On this basis, there would be a requirement for the provision of 106 (maximum) parking spaces.
19. No additional car parking will be provided as part of the proposed scheme; rather the scheme will result in the loss of 55 car parking spaces and 1 disabled parking space. The applicant has submitted a Transport Statement

(TS) in support of the application to assess the changes in the supply and demand of car parking spaces resulting from the proposed development.

20. The TS indicates that the site currently provides a total of 972 car parking spaces, 350 of which are surface level spaces located principally at the western end of the site, with the remaining 622 spaces being located in the multi storey car park. An assessment of existing car parking usage on Friday, Saturday and Sunday (13 – 15 March 2015) has been presented as part of the TS. This assessment demonstrates that the observed peak car occupancy was 421 spaces which occurred at noon on the Saturday. The TS indicates that over 500 car parking spaces remained vacant throughout the survey period. The TS acknowledges that there are retail vacancies within Stretford Mall and office vacancies within Arndale House. Notwithstanding this, even if these were fully occupied the TS concludes that there will be sufficient vacant spaces during peak periods to accommodate any additional car parking demands based upon the Council's maximum parking standards. On the basis of the parking assessment included in the TS, the Local Highway Authority raises no objections to the proposals and considers that there is sufficient parking provision within the development.

Travel Plan

21. NPPF paragraph 36 states that all developments which generate significant amounts of transport movements should be required to provide a Travel Plan. Core Strategy policy L4.13 states further that the Travel Plan should include measures to reduce congestion, improve road safety and promote public transport, walking and cycling as part of an integrated approach to managing travel demand. Although it is not considered that the development will result in a significant increase of trips, the proposed development will form part of Stretford Mall shopping centre and therefore the development, as a whole, would generate significant amounts of transport movements. A planning condition was imposed as part of the previous application requiring the submission of an updated Travel Plan for the Stretford Mall shopping centre. It is considered that the submission of an updated Travel Plan for Stretford Mall remains relevant and is necessary in order to influence travel behaviour and promote the sustainable travel to / from the shopping centre.

POLLUTION

22. Core Strategy policy L5.13 indicates that development that causes adverse pollution of air, light, water, ground, noise or vibration will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that adequate mitigation measures can be put in place. The following sections of the report provide an assessment of these matters.

Noise

23. The nearest residential properties to the proposed units are located on Wellington Street, Barton Road and Kingsway. These dwellings are located between 60 and 80 metres from the proposed foodstore. The proposed hours

of operation for the foodstore are 08.00 to 22.00 - Mondays to Saturdays; and 10.00 to 16.00 on Sundays. It is noted that the proposed hours extend beyond that approved under the previous permission (08.00 to 21.00 - Mondays to Saturdays; and 10.00 to 16.00 on Sunday) however it is not considered that this would result in an unacceptable impact upon the amenity of nearby residential occupiers.

24. The previous consent restricted the delivery times of vehicles to the foodstore to between 07.00 to 19.00 Monday to Saturday and 10.00 to 16.00 on Sundays and Bank holidays, in the interests of protecting residential amenity. A planning condition is therefore recommended to ensure that delivery times are restricted in accordance with these provisions.
25. The kiosks will be accessible from Stretford Mall itself with no external access provided as part of the scheme. As such, the kiosks will operate in accordance with the existing opening hours of the Mall (0800 -1800 Monday – Saturday; 0800 – 2000 Thursday and Friday; and 1000 – 1600 Sundays and Bank holidays).
26. Subject to the inclusion of the conditions discussed above, it is considered the amenity of nearby residential properties will be adequately protected in accordance with Core Strategy Policy L5.13

Contaminated land

27. NPPF paragraph 121 states that planning decisions should ensure that the proposed site is suitable for its new use taking account of ground conditions, including pollution arising from previous uses and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation or impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation. The Council's Contaminated Land Officer has reviewed the proposed scheme and identifies that the site is located on brownfield land and as such has recommended that the applicant submits a Preliminary Risk Assessment to assess the potential contamination risks of the site and whether any remediation measures are necessary. These matters can be secured by a suitably worded condition and as such comply with the provisions of Core Strategy policy L5.13.

DRAINAGE

28. Core Strategy policy L5.18 aims to reduce surface water run off through the use of appropriate measures. The applicant has indicated that surface water and foul sewage will be disposed of via the mains sewer. The Council's Drainage Engineer has reviewed the scheme and has indicated that peak discharge storm water rates should be constrained in accordance with the limits indicated in the Council's Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment document. A planning condition is therefore recommended to secure these appropriate discharge rates.

LANDSCAPING

29. Core Strategy policy W2.11 indicates that developments are required to deliver high quality public realm. Core Strategy policy L7.1 states that development must enhance the streetscene or character of the area through the use of appropriate hard and soft landscaping proposals. The site plan indicates that an area of hardstanding will be provided to the Mall entrance to link to an existing area of public realm, whilst an area of soft landscaping will be provided to the front of the food store. It is noted that the previous application included a financial obligation towards the provision of green infrastructure provision. Table 3.4 of the Planning Obligations SPD identifies tree requirements for all types of development stating that 1 tree is required per 50 square metres (GIA). The extension would provide an additional 935 square metres of retail floorspace resulting in a requirement of 19 trees. At this stage, no specific landscaping details are provided as part of the planning application however a landscaping condition is recommended to ensure that an appropriate landscaping scheme is provided on site. Through the discharge of condition process there will be an expectation that an appropriate quantum of native trees are provided on site taking into consideration the area of land afforded to soft landscaping.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

30. This proposal is subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and comes under the category of 'Supermarkets within defined centres', 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).

31. No other planning obligations are required.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSIONS

32. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, requires that an application for planning permission is determined in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF does not change the statutory presumption in favour of the development plan but is an important material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

33. The application site is located within Stretford Town Centre as defined on the UDP Proposals Map. The site is located within an accessible and sustainable town centre location. The scale of the proposed development is considered acceptable for a retail centre of this size and function and would represent a significant investment within a priority town centre location. The development would increase the likelihood of linked trips to the existing retail offer within the centre and would present the most sustainable way of meeting the retail needs of residents, whilst contributing towards maintaining and improving the

vibrancy of the town centre as a shopping and leisure destination. In addition to the physical regeneration benefits of the scheme, it would provide economic benefits in relation to the creation of jobs with a variety of flexible full and part time positions anticipated.

34. Other issues including design, design and crime, highways and parking, pollution, drainage and landscaping have all been considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the Development Plan, or where necessary can be satisfactorily managed through the imposition of planning conditions. Having considered all material planning considerations within the overall balance, it is recommended that the application is approved, subject to conditions outlined below.

RECOMMENDATION:


GRANT subject to the following conditions:-

1. Time limit 3 years
2. Details in accordance with approved plans
3. Samples of materials to be submitted
4. Landscaping details to be submitted
5. Limit quantum of gross floorspace to 1580 square metres
6. Hours of opening of the foodstore will be restricted to 08:00 – 22:00 Monday to Saturday and 10.00 to 16.00 on Sundays
7. No deliveries outside the hours of 07.00 to 19.00 Monday to Saturday and 10.00 to 16.00 on Sundays and Bank holidays
8. Details of any external security measures to be submitted and agreed in writing
9. Details of external lighting to be submitted and agreed in writing
10. Contaminated land
11. Submission of drainage details
12. Details of cycle and trolley storage to be submitted and approved
13. Updated Travel Plan to be submitted

JP



Unit 5A Stretford Mall Extension, Stretford Shopping Mall, Chester Road, 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 14/05/2015
Date	30/04/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

WARD: Urmston

85020/FUL/15

DEPARTURE: YES

Part retrospective application for the erection of a three-storey building providing 5no. two-bedroom apartments, and car parking and landscaping, to allow for a larger footprint than that approved under planning permission 74382/FULL/2009.

130A Flixton Road, Urmston, M41 5BG

APPLICANT: Black or White Ltd

AGENT: Heslip Architects and Surveyors

RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to conditions

SITE

This application relates to a 0.065 hectare site located on the northern side of Flixton Road in Urmston.

The application site was formerly occupied by a two storey detached residential property, however this has recently been demolished and the site is in the process of being developed via the erection of a three storey building containing five, 2 bedroom apartments.

The application site is located within a mixed use area – there is a nursery at 130 Flixton Road and there is a medical centre at 132 Flixton Road. The remainder of the neighbouring properties are in residential use.

PROPOSAL

In September 2014 planning permission was granted under application 74382/FULL/2009 for the demolition of the dwelling at 130A Flixton Road and the re-development of the site via the erection of a part two, part three storey building containing five, 2 bedroom apartments.

The site owner has started to implement this permission; demolishing the dwelling which formerly occupied the site and starting work on the erection of the new apartment building.

This application has been submitted in order to allow the footprint of the building to be increased via the squaring off of the north-western corner in order to allow the main bedrooms in the two flats at the rear of the building to be enlarged. The revisions would not affect the visual appearance of the building from Flixton Road, neither would they alter the level of parking provision proposed.

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

L1 – Land for New Homes
 L2 – Meeting Housing Needs
 L4 – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility
 L5 – Climate Change
 L7 – Design
 L8 – Planning obligations

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

None

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT 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

84370/VAR/14 - Variation of condition 2 (Named Plans) of planning permission 74382/FULL/2009 (erection of apartment block) to increase footprint of ground and first-floors of building to the rear – Withdrawn March 2015

83934/COND/2014 – Application for approval of details reserved by conditions of grant of planning permission 74382/FULL/2009. Condition numbers 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12 and 13 – Pending consideration

74382/FULL/2009 - Erection of a part three storey, part two storey building to accommodate five flats with associated car parking and landscaping after demolition of existing buildings – Approved 29.09.2014

H/OUT/67795 – Outline application for demolition of existing dwelling houses and erection of 12 affordable two bedroom flats with associated parking (consent sought for layout, scale and access with all other matters reserved) – Withdrawn October 2007

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has submitted the following in support of their application –

- Design and access statement
- Land contamination report
- CIL Form

CONSULTATIONS

LHA – No comments received to date

Built Environment (Drainage) – Advise that it will be necessary to constrain the peak discharge of storm water from this development in accordance with the limits indicated in the Guidance Document to the Manchester City, Salford City and Trafford Council's Level 2 Hybrid Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. No development shall be commenced unless and until full details of the proposals to meet the requirements of the Guidance have been submitted to and 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 shall be retained and maintained thereafter.

REPRESENTATIONS

Two letters of representation have been received in response to this application. The following issues have been raised –

- There are existing parking problems at the junction of Flixton Road and Legwood Court due to the double yellow lines being ignored, with Flixton Road being very busy due to the nearby school, the pre-school nursery and the medical centre.

The proposed development would add to an already busy and potentially dangerous part of Flixton Road

- In order that the proposal does not affect the level of residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring residents the extension to the footprint should not affect the 16m separation between the new building and the properties at the rear on Glenhaven Avenue.

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

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. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF advises that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. 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.
2. 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, 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.
3. The principle of demolishing the existing dwelling and re-developing the site via the erection of a new, three storey, building containing five, 2 bedroom apartments was established under planning approval 74382/FULL/2009 and consequently there are no in principle issues with the proposed development.

DESIGN

4. 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.

5. 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.
6. The proposed apartment block would be three stories in height measuring a maximum of 7.4m in height at the eaves and 10.6m in height at the ridge with a pitched roof. Having regard to the varied building heights within the locality which includes bungalows, two storey detached, semi-detached and terraced properties and a three storey block of flats it is considered that the scale and massing of the proposed apartment block is acceptable.
7. The proposed apartment block would be of a brick construction, being designed in such a way that it would reflect the style and character of the two adjacent properties, incorporating bay windows at ground and first floor which serve to break up the façade and give it a similar vertical emphasis to the adjacent properties.
8. The apartment building would present an active frontage to Flixton Road, being sited so it would respect the established building line along Flixton Road. The development would also have a plot layout that is comparable to the other properties in the immediate vicinity incorporating an area of car parking to the front of the building and a rear garden area, which would provide a shared garden area. In order to soften the impact of the parking court it is proposed to introduce a landscape buffer to Flixton Road.
9. Overall it is therefore considered that the proposal would be in keeping with the development it will be seen in context with and consequently, subject of the attachment of a condition to ensure the use of satisfactory materials and appropriate landscaping, the proposed development would make a positive contribution to the visual amenities of the area by bringing a vacant site into use. 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

10. 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.

11. The property at 130 Flixton Road is being used as a nursery, while 132 Flixton Road is being used as a doctor's surgery with an on-site pharmacy and therefore the two adjacent units are considered to be non-sensitive land uses. The proposed increase in the building's footprint would result in the proposed building projecting an additional 1.9m along the common boundary with 132 Flixton Road, with the new building extending just beyond the rear wall of the existing single storey extension at 132 Flixton Road. The revisions to the proposal would not alter the buildings relationship to 130 Flixton Road. Having regard to the non-sensitive nature of the uses at 130 and 132 Flixton Road it is not considered that the proposal would have any adverse impact upon the level of amenity the users of 130 and 132 Flixton Road can reasonably expect to enjoy.
12. The land to the rear of the application site is occupied by part of the garden area of the residential property at 35 Glenhaven Avenue, with the property at 35 Glenhaven being sited so its rear elevation fronts the shared boundary with 132 and 132a Flixton Road, not the common boundary with the application site. The revisions to the proposal would not result in the building coming any closer to the rear boundary of the site than the building approved under application 74382/FULL/2009, with at least 16m being retained to the sites rear boundary. Having regard to the relationship between the proposed development and 35 Glenhaven Avenue it is not considered that the proposal would result in those at 35 Glenhaven Avenue experiencing a loss of light, privacy and/or any overbearing impact.
13. There is a two story block of flats on the opposite side of Flixton Road at 1-6 Longwood Court. The revisions to the footprint of the building would not alter the relationship of the proposed building to the flats on Longwood Court, with approximately 40m being maintained between the main front elevation of the proposed apartment block and the front elevation of the proposed flats. It is therefore considered that adequate separation would be provided to ensure that the introduction of the proposed apartments would not adversely affect the level of residential amenity the occupants of 1-6 Longwood Court can reasonably expect to enjoy.
14. With regard to the level of amenity future occupants of the proposed apartments would enjoy each apartment would be provided with adequate light and outlook from their habitable room windows as all of the living room areas and all bar one of the bedroom areas would be served by full windows, with the other bedroom being served by a velux window that would be positioned so as to provide outlook as well as light. The proposed apartments would also be provided with an area of useable private amenity space in the form of a communal rear patio area and garden, which measures approximately 197sqm, significantly more than the 90sqm required under the Council's Guidelines for new residential development which recommends the provision of 18sqm of communal space per apartment.
15. 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 living

PARKING AND HIGHWAY SAFETY

16. Policy L4 of the Trafford Core Strategy seeks to ensure that all new developments do not adversely affect highway safety, with each development being provided with adequate on-site parking, having regard to the maximum standards set out in appendix 3.
17. According to appendix 3 of the Trafford Core Strategy a development of five 2 bedroom apartments in this location should be provided with a maximum of 10 parking spaces.
18. Under application planning approval 74382/FULL/2009 the principle of having 5 car parking spaces for a development of five 2 bedrooomed apartments was accepted as the parking standards are maximum not minimum standards, with the application site being located within an accessible location being well located in terms of access to public transport and goods and services. The Local Highway Authority commented on application 74382/FULL/2009 that any on street parking that is created by the proposed development would be dispersed in neighbouring streets, making any overspill acceptable.
19. Having regard to these facts and given that the proposed parking layout is as previously approved under application 74382/FULL/2009 it is not considered that the proposal raises any issues from a highway safety perspective; a suitable means of access would be provided together with adequate car parking, which would be arranged in an appropriate layout.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

20. The development involves the demolition of an existing dwelling within a moderate charging area and the erection of a new building containing 5 apartments. Consequently the proposal does not trigger the requirement for any payment under CIL.
21. In accordance with Policy L8 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the revised SPD 1 on Planning Obligations it is however necessary to provide an element of specific green infrastructure.
22. The applicant has submitted a draft landscape scheme with their application in order to demonstrate that 5 trees can be planted on site, thereby meeting the requirement for the provision of specific green infrastructure. In order to secure the 5 trees a landscape condition will be attached which makes specific reference to the need to provide 5 trees as on site as part of the landscape proposals.
23. With regard to affordable housing, the revised SPD1 on planning obligations requires that within a moderate market location such as Urmston any development comprising 5 or more new dwellings should provide an element

of affordable housing, the level of which will be 20% under “normal” market conditions and 10% under “cold” market conditions such as those being experienced at present. However, a ministerial statement was issued on the 28th November 2014 which advised that affordable housing and tariff style s106 contributions should not be sought for developments of 10 or less residential units. The Ministerial Statement has been incorporated into National Planning Policy and as such it is material in the consideration of this planning application. Consequently despite the requirements set out in the revised SPD1 there is no requirement to provide affordable housing as part of this development and/or to make a financial contribution towards the provision of affordable units off site.

RECOMMENDATION:


GRANT subject to the following conditions:-

1. Approved plans
2. Approved materials
3. Landscaping scheme including the provision of 5 trees – within 2 months of the decision date
4. Landscape maintenance for 5 years – within 2 months of the decision date
5. Bin store details – within 2 months of the decision date
6. Boundary treatment details – within 2 months of the decision date
7. Meter box details – within 2 months of the decision date
8. Details of fenestration, window reveals and heads and cills to the windows – within 2 months of the decision date
9. Provision of car parking
10. First and second floor windows in the eastern and western elevation fixed shut and fitted with obscure glazing
11. Cycle storage – within 2 months of the decision date
12. Drainage scheme – within 1 month of the decision date

NT



130A Flixton Road, Urmston



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 14/05/2015
Date	05/05/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

WARD: Altrincham

85116/HHA/15

DEPARTURE: No

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF PART SINGLE/PART FIRST FLOOR SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION. WIDENING OF EXISTING DRIVEWAY (RE-SUBMISSION OF 84518/HHA/14)

ADDRESS: 31 Honiton Way, Altrincham, WA14 4UW

APPLICANT: Mr Jonny Hewitt

AGENT: Mr Paul Domville

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

This application has been called in by Councillor Sephton for consideration by the Planning Committee for the reasons given in the report.

SITE

This application relates to a detached dwelling house in a residential estate to the west of Altrincham centre. The property is located at a prominent bend in the road with Honiton Way passing the property's front (north-west) and side (north-east) elevations. The plot comprises of 'open plan' front and rear gardens, a side (north-east) grassed area adjacent to Honiton Way, a single storey rear outrigger and a detached single garage adjacent to the back garden, the latter accessed by a length of hard standing running the length of the property's gable elevation. The back garden and the common boundary with the adjacent property to the south (No. 33 Honiton Way) is marked by a 1.8m high wood panel fence. The plot is surrounded by residential properties on all sides.

PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes to carry out extensive works entailing a part single storey/part 2 storey side extension, and a part single storey/part 2 storey/part first floor rear extension, the latter above the retained rear outrigger, with these joining the retained converted and amended garage, together with extensive roof amendments, and an extended area of hard standing to the side (north) of the property. These elements would have dual-pitched roofs with gable ends apart from a side element which would have a mono-pitch roof. The development would accommodate at ground floor an extended hall, dining room/snug and kitchen, a repositioned staircase, together with a new WC and utility room, in addition to a store room in part of the converted garage (the remainder part accommodating the extended/repositioned kitchen). At first floor level the development would accommodate a repositioned stair way and landing, together with repositioned and extended bedrooms (one en-suite). At ground floor the development would introduce a front (north-west) facing utility room door, side (north-east) facing hall, utility room and kitchen windows and a rear (south-east) facing snug/dining room glazed bi-fold door. At first floor the development would introduce a side (north-east) facing stairway window and 2 rear facing bedroom windows. The amended roof would include 3 skylights in its side (north-east) facing roof slope.

The applicant also proposes to insert a side (north-east) facing kitchen window together with a further side (south-west) facing kitchen window and store room door, however these will be inserted in the retained garage's side facing walls and therefore would benefit from deemed consent as per Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the General Permitted Development Order 1995 (as amended).

The applicant proposes to install a new area of hard standing, however this will be constructed from porous material and therefore would fall within the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class F of the General Permitted Development Order 1995 (as amended) and therefore benefits from a deemed grant of planning permission.

This application is a resubmission of a previously withdrawn application (reference 84518/HHA/14). The applicant had been advised that the previous application would be unacceptable in terms of its design impact and its amenity impact upon the adjacent property to the south-west (No. 33 Honiton Way). The difference between the 2 proposals is that the original submission included a longer 2 storey rear extension (the current proposal's 2 storey rear extension is 1m shorter than the original proposal) with no single storey rear element, together with a slightly amended position for one of the proposed side facing roof lights, the former amendment requested to address the amenity impact on this neighbouring property.

The proposed development would increase the property's internal floor space by 48 square metres.

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 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 01 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 2013. On the 13 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 26 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

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

84518/HHA/14: Erection of part single, part first floor side and rear extension. Application withdrawn 6 March 2015.

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

None.

CONSULTATIONS

Drainage: Should the development go ahead the applicant may require a build over agreement from United Utilities.

REPRESENTATIONS

Councillor Sephton – Has called the application in for consideration by the Planning Development Control Committee. "The Applicant has amended the original application (85116) and in doing so has resolved the issue relating to the impact on the amenities of the adjacent neighbour, to the satisfaction of the planning officers. In an effort to reach an acceptable Planning Application the Applicant has continued to work closely with the Planning Service, but has reached an impasse relating to the design of the development - in particular the parking layout. In the circumstances therefore I consider that it would be reasonable to formally call in the Application to be considered and determined by the Planning Committee. "

Neighbours - Two letters of objection have been received from neighbouring properties. The concerns raised are as follows;

- The plot currently causes parking problems which would be increased by the proposed development.

- The development would reduce the space for off-street parking from 3 to 2 vehicles.
- The parking area would spread across an area directly opposite to the front of No. 20 Honiton Way, and will no doubt in the future expand to include the retained grassed area to the side.
- The proposed area of hard standing would provide insufficient scope for off-street parking and would have a negative impact upon vehicle/pedestrian safety and parking within the wider estate.
- Approving the repositioned hard standing would restrict the views of vehicles exiting No. 29 Honiton Way thereby undermining highway's safety.
- The resulting unacceptable parking provision would restrict access for service and emergency vehicles.
- The submitted plans include vehicle outlines which are incorrectly scaled.
- The proposed development, including its roof amendments, would be out of character with and not in proportion with the original and neighbouring properties.
- This negative visual impact would be exacerbated by the plot's prominent location on a narrow plot within the estate.
- The proposed extensions would undermine the estate's current 'open plan' character.
- The proposed development would result in an overdevelopment of the plot.
- The proposed side and rear extensions will severely reduce the outlook from No. 20 Honiton Way's front facing windows and openings including habitable room windows.
- The development would remove views of the skyline and vegetation.
- The proposed development would result in an unacceptable overshadowing impact upon No. 29 Honiton Way.
- The proposed development would introduce side and rear facing windows which would result in an unacceptable privacy impact on both Nos. 20 and 29 Honiton Way.
- The development will result in more noise from the property.
- The proposed development would facilitate extensions to a residential property. It is not considered that the development will result in an unacceptable noise amenity impact.
- The proposed extension would be in breach of covenants currently in force for the plot and the wider estate.

OBSERVATIONS

DESIGN AND APPEARANCE

1. Policy L7 of the Core Strategy requires development to 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. In addition SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations requires extensions to reflect the character, scale and form of the original dwelling by matching and harmonising with the existing architectural style and detailing.

2. The application site is on a corner plot at a prominent location within the residential estate, especially when looking west along Honiton Way towards the rear of the property. The property's visibility within the street scene is increased by the fact that the estate is 'open plan' with the plot not having boundary treatments facing Honiton Way. It is also noted that the plot is relatively restricted with a relatively small area between the property's side wall and Honiton Way, this area being partly grassed with the remainder accommodating a length of hard standing.
3. The proposed single storey side extensions would maintain a minimum 3.3m gap between their side elevations and the site boundary adjacent to Honiton Way, and they would not take up more than 50% of the garden area to the side of the property. These elements would not project beyond the retained garage's side wall facing Honiton Way.
4. The proposed extensions would have external materials which would match those of the original property.
5. Despite these factors the proposal would nevertheless have an unacceptable design impact.
6. As noted above the site includes a grassed side area which complements the open plan garden areas to the front of properties to the south-east on Honiton Way, especially when looking west along this road towards the rear of the applicant's property. This quality of space to the front of these neighbouring properties and to the side of the applicant's house is considered to be an important visual characteristic of the wider residential estate. Whilst it is accepted that the development would not project any further than the retained garage's side wall, the extensions would significantly reduce the space to the side of the property which would negatively impact how this plot sits within this established character of the estate.
7. The development would result in a relatively large side and rear extension which would incorporate the current garage as part of the main building. It is considered that these extensions would not respect the scale of the original property and would dominate the original building especially with reference to the proposed enlarged main roof which would be substantially larger than the current main roof. Taken as a whole the extensions would compete with the original building to the detriment of the property's appearance. This impact would be especially apparent when viewed from the houses on the opposite side of Honiton Way which would face the full extended length of the applicant's property.
8. The size of the proposed extensions and the fact that there is a limited amount of space to the side of the property would result in an unacceptable cramped impression post development within the street scene. This impact would be exacerbated by the fact the plot is at a visually prominent location within the wider residential estate.
9. The extension would require the repositioning of the plots area of hard standing to the side of the property. Whilst it is accepted that this amended parking area

would not require an express grant of planning permission, with the property retaining its permitted development rights, the additional parking at this point to the side of the property would add to the above mentioned unacceptable cramped visual impression post development.

10. SPD4 states that roof designs should match and complement the existing roof and should not consist of awkward roof detailing. Contrived roofs will not be looked upon favourably due to their negative visual impact. Extensions which are out of character with the style and scale of the original dwelling, for example through being irregularly shaped or contrived, will be resisted. It is noted that SPD4 paragraph 3.2.2 specifically states that side extensions on corner plots should be designed to minimise their visual impact on the street scene, which is considered not to be the case with this proposal.
11. The proposal is poorly designed and would result in an awkward and unsympathetic main roof design with multiple side facing walls. This would unbalance the design of the original building in addition to being out of character with the original property and properties within the wider estate. It is noted that properties within the wider estate generally have a set roof type in terms of symmetrical dual pitched roofs and have single side facing wall elevations. The proposal would result in an unbalanced dual pitched roof with that adjacent to Honiton Way being notably longer than that on the opposite side of the property. This would be exacerbated by the fact that this aspect of the development would be most prominent looking west along Honiton Way when viewed from the rear of the plot, where the property is most prominent within the street scene. Therefore this aspect of the proposed development would not maintain and reinforce the style of the main building and would not blend in with or respect the street scene, but rather would result in a harmful unacceptable visual anomaly.
12. Therefore the design would substantially detract from the appearance of the current property and the wider area contrary to SPD4 A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations and Policy L7 of the Core Strategy.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

13. 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.
14. The proposed rear extensions will include a 2 storey extension with a single storey element projecting to its rear. The rear of the property currently includes a single storey rear element which would be partly demolished; however the proposed single storey element would not project beyond the current single storey element's rear wall.

15. The proposed first floor rear extension would project 2.4m beyond the property's main rear wall and would be set in 0.9m from the common boundary with the adjacent property to the south-west (No. 33 Honiton Way). This would comply with SPD4 paragraph 3.4.3 which allows for first floor extensions which project 1.5m plus the distance they are set in from the common boundary. It is considered the extension would not be unduly overbearing to the occupiers of that property.
16. The proposed development would introduce at ground floor level a rear facing glazed habitable room bi-fold door. Whilst this would be less than the 10.5m minimum distance to the rear boundary (8.6m) this is nevertheless acceptable because this would simply replicate the current rear facing kitchen window.
17. At first floor level the development would introduce 2 rear facing bedroom windows which would be less than the 10.5m minimum distance from the rear boundary (8.9m), however these windows would simply overlook the front garden and area of hard standing to the front of the adjacent property to the south-east (No. 29 Honiton Way) which is currently readily visible within the street scene. These windows would not directly face any neighbouring first floor habitable room windows.
18. The side extension would introduce a side (north) facing kitchen window which would directly face the adjacent property to the north (No. 20 Honiton Way) with the separation distance less than the 10.5m minimum (8.3m), however it is important to have regard to the fact that this area comprises of highway, front garden and area of hard standing which is currently readily visible within the street scene and therefore does currently enjoy the same level of privacy that is enjoyed in the rear gardens.
19. Part of the proposed side extension would be directly faced by a neighbouring property's (No. 20 Honiton Way) ground and first floor habitable room windows at a distance of 13.1m. Whilst it is accepted that SPD4 paragraph 2.17.3 states that there should be a minimum 15m separation distance between such neighbouring windows and proposed walls, it is also noted that this rule applies to a proposed 2 storey blank gable wall. The proposed side extension is essentially single storey, albeit with a large roof above and a portion of 2 storey gable. The facing ground and first floor windows will essentially face the single storey side element and the proposed roof, with the latter sloping away from the neighbour's facing first floor habitable room windows. Therefore the proposal is considered to have an acceptable overbearing impact.
20. The proposed side facing skylights would be 1.8m above floor level and therefore would not have an unacceptable privacy impact upon neighbouring properties.
21. It is not considered that the proposed development would result in an unacceptable noise impact upon neighbouring properties.
22. The proposed development would not have an unacceptable overbearing, overshadowing or privacy impact on neighbouring properties.

PARKING

23. Post development the property would retain its current 3 bedrooms and would have 2 off-street parking spaces which would comply with the Parking SPD. As noted above the proposed amended parking would not require an express grant of planning permission.

24. In response to the specific points raised by neighbours it is noted that the proposed driveway element would fall within Schedule 2, Part 1, Class F of the General Permitted Development Order 1995 (as amended) because it would be constructed from porous materials and therefore would benefit from a deemed grant of planning permission. It is noted that the amended driveway would continue to use the property's current dropped crossing.

CONCLUSION

25. It is considered that the proposed development would be unacceptable in terms of its design and visual amenity impact. It is therefore recommended that planning permission should be refused.


RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

The proposed development, by reason of its scale, siting, design and finished appearance would result in a cramped form of development, inappropriate in its context and harmful to character and quality of the host building and street scene, contrary to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and Supplementary Planning Document 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations.

TP



31 Honiton Way, 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 14/05/2015
Date	30/04/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)

WARD: Hale Central

85173/HHA/15

DEPARTURE: No

ERECTION OF PART SINGLE, PART TWO STOREY FRONT, SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION.

31 Grove Lane, Hale WA15 8JF

APPLICANT: Mr Philip Whitehouse

AGENT: Mr Mark Thompson, Greenhalgh & Williams

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

The application has been reported to the Planning Development Control Committee because the applicant's partner is an employee of Trafford Council.

SITE

This application relates to a semi-detached two storey dwelling house located in a residential area to the west of the centre of Hale village and sited at the junction of Grove Lane with Lomond Avenue, a cul de sac of four detached properties located at a lower level than Grove Lane. Aside from the building itself, the plot comprises one off-street car parking space and a small garden area to the front of the property, with a side and rear boundary fence reaching a maximum of 1.8m enclosing a side and rear garden. Recently, a detached garage has been demolished to the side of the dwelling. To the rear of the building, there is a single storey outrigger with lean-to roof and the connecting property, No.33 Grove Lane, has a conservatory that is adjacent to the common boundary that projects approximately 2.5m, 0.5m from the common boundary and then splays off to a maximum of 3.3m.

There is a strip of unadopted land located between the western boundary of the site and Lomond Avenue which is owned by No.25 Grove Lane and contains a row of mature conifers that are closely positioned to one another and the hedge is located towards the rear of the application property to provide some privacy for neighbouring residents.

The rear garden is approximately 12.5m in length from the main rear elevation to the rear boundary, with the garden on an incline towards the rear to meet the level ground of Lomond Avenue to the north. The frontages of Nos.1-4 Lomond Avenue are open with large habitable rooms at both ground and first floor level.

The property is surrounded by residential properties on all sides.

PROPOSAL

The applicant has recently demolished a detached garage to the side of the property and proposes to demolish a single storey outrigger to its rear prior to erecting a two storey side extension, set back from the front main corner of the property by approximately 2.3m, have a width of 2.8m and align with the main rear wall of the property. To the rear, a single storey extension projecting 4.15m, with a width of

6.8m is proposed, maintaining a minimum separation distance of 900mm from the common boundary shared with the connecting property, 33 Grove Lane. This enlargement of the property would create a kitchen/breakfast area to the rear of the property with roof lanterns providing additional light from above, and an attached garage with a bedroom above to the side of the existing property that would create a three bedroom property.

The current proposal has been altered from the recently approved development (planning permission 84427/HHA/2014) by retaining the previously approved overall width (2.8m) but would with a 2.2 metre set back from the front elevation at ground and first floor level compared to very little set back on the approved scheme, also the first floor element is now proposed to be the full width of the ground floor extension whereas previously it projected only 1.5 metre to the side. The extension would not be as deep at first floor level as previously approved. The proposed single storey rear element would remain unchanged.

The proposed development would increase the property's internal floor space by 42m².

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 01 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. 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

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

84427/HHA/2014 - Erection of part single, part two storey front, side and rear extension. Granted with conditions 20th February 2015.

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

None.

CONSULTATIONS

LHA – No comments received. Any received will be included within the Additional Information Report.

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbours: No comments received.

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;
 - 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, boundary treatment.
2. SPD 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations requires extensions to reflect the character, scale and form of the original dwelling by matching and harmonising with the existing architectural style and detailing. The SPD sets out specific guidance relating to these areas.
3. Para 3.1.1 of the above guidance states that "Side extensions should be appropriately scaled, designed and sited so as to ensure that they do not:
 - Appear unacceptably prominent,

- Erode the sense of spaciousness within an area
- Detract from a dwelling's character.
- Adversely affect the amenities of neighbouring properties”.

4. Paragraph 3.3.1 supports the above by stating that “Extensions on corner properties, between the side of the house and the road, can appear unduly prominent and obtrusive, particularly if they come forward of the general line of the fronts of neighbouring properties. Extensions in these locations should not be visually over-dominating or disrupt the sense of openness between the properties and the street scene.
5. Regarding the proposed single storey element to the side of the property, paragraph 3.3.3 states “... generally, a minimum separation distance of 2m must be maintained between the edge of any single storey extension and the site boundary. These minimum separation distances may need to be exceeded however for two storey extensions or to safeguard the prevailing spacious character, and in any case will take into account the building line and extent of side garden remaining”.
6. The siting of the proposed two storey element would be set further back from the front corner of the property than previously approved (2.2m instead of 0.7m) and would be 2.8m in width at first floor level instead of 1.5m. Less than 2m would be provided as a separation distance between it and the western boundary which is contrary to the above guidance. However, the use of the adjacent land directly to the west of the application site in order to provide sufficient spaciousness is considered acceptable, with approximately 2.2m being provided between the footpath of Lomond Avenue and the side extension. This is considered to be acceptable in the context of the site, the juxtaposition of neighbouring properties and the character of the streetscene.
7. The length of the proposed two storey side extension would be 5.6m and therefore a reduction from 7.8m within 84427/HHA/2014. The size, scale and massing of the two storey side extension, although wider by 1.3m, would still be screened in part by the row of conifers on the western side of the application site and its positioning, being subordinate the host building, is considered not to cause detrimental harm to the spaciousness of the streetscene. The proposed development is therefore considered to comply with the Council's guidance with regards to properties located at a junction within SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions & Alterations (2012).
8. External materials would match those of the original building and the design of the extension would be generally in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling, with fenestration details both at ground and first floor levels being appropriately designed.
9. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would be acceptable in terms of design and visual impact in the street scene and would comply with Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy in this respect.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

10. 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.
11. The development would introduce a rear facing ground floor kitchen window and glazed bi-fold door serving a habitable room which would directly face the boundary to the rear; this would be visible from occupiers within primarily 2 and 4 Lomond Avenue, however, being at ground floor level this would be acceptable because the separation distance provided between it and the front elevation of 2 Lomond Avenue would be approximately 18.5m with an intervening 1.8m high boundary fence providing additional privacy screening. There is a pedestrian access gate within the rear boundary to allow for the movement of bins.
12. The extension would introduce a window to the first floor rear elevation to provide light to the proposed bedroom. As this would align with an existing habitable room window and be in excess of 21m to the nearest habitable room window of 2 Lomond Avenue, no detrimental harm would occur to neighbouring residents.
13. The neighbouring property, 25 Grove Lane is sited at the other side of the junction and has its principle elevation facing in an easterly direction. Its southern and western boundaries consist of a mature conifer hedge which provides some screening from neighbouring properties. The current proposal would marginally reduce the spaciousness between the two properties but a separation distance of approximately 17m between the two storey side extension and the habitable room windows would be retained and in excess of the Council's recommended provision of 15m to maintain amenity. There are no windows at first floor level in the proposed extension facing 25 Grove Lane. The development would thereby satisfy the criteria within paragraph 2.17.3 of SPD4:A Guide for Designing House Extensions & Alterations (2012).
14. Regarding the adjoining property, 33 Grove Lane, that dwelling has a conservatory to its rear that is positioned adjacent to the common boundary with the application site. It projects approximately 3.4m and therefore the proposed single storey rear extension projecting 4150mm, 900mm from the common boundary at its closest point would be compliant with the guidelines and would not cause detrimental harm to the occupants. For clarity this aspect of the current proposal has not been altered from 84427/HHA/14.
15. The proposed development would not cause residential amenity to occupiers on the southern side of Grove Lane.
16. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable overbearing, overshadowing or privacy impact on neighbouring

properties and would comply with Policy L7 of the Core Strategy in this respect.

VEHICULAR PARKING

17. The original property provided one off-street car parking space to its frontage and a detached garage to its side that has recently been demolished. The Council's guidance within SPD3: Parking Standards and Design states that a three bedroom property would be required to provide two parking spaces. The submitted details show a driveway depth of approximately 6.7m in front of the proposed garage. As such, two off street car parking spaces would be able to be provided and be compliant with the guidance provided above.

CONCLUSION

18. The proposed extension would be acceptable in terms of visual and residential amenity and would comply with Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and 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. Materials to be submitted
4. No further openings
5. Garage condition

GD



31 Grove Lane, 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 14/05/2015
Date	30/04/2015
MSA Number	100023172 (2012)