

AGENDA ITEM 3

PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT CONTROL) COMMITTEE – 10th March 2016

ADDENDUM TO THE AGENDA:

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT (INCLUDING SPEAKERS)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report summarises information received since the Agenda was compiled including, as appropriate, suggested amendments to recommendations in the light of that information. It also lists those people wishing to address the Committee.

1.2 Where the Council has received a request to address the Committee, the applications concerned will be considered first in the order indicated in the table below. The remaining applications will then be considered in the order shown on the original agenda unless indicated by the Chairman.

2.0 ITEM 4 – APPLICATIONS FOR PERMISSION TO DEVELOP, ETC.

REVISED ORDER OF AGENDA (SPEAKERS)

Part 1 Applications for Planning Permission					
Application	Site Address/Location of Development	Ward	Page	Speakers	
				Against RECOMMENDATION	For REC.
84072	The Moose Bar, 193 Ashley Road, Hale, WA15 9SQ	Hale Central	1	✓	
85566	Yew Tree Farm, 240 Davyhulme Road, Flixton, M41 8QH	Davyhulme West	10		✓
86115	Bowdon Lawn Tennis Club, Elcho Road, Bowdon, WA14 2TH	Bowdon	25	✓	✓
86213	9-13 Washway Road, Sale, M33 7AD	Priory	37		
86576	Neuholme, Manchester Road, Partington, M31 4FB	Bucklow St Martins	51		
86904	Cargil, Trafford Park Road, Trafford Park, M17 1PA	Gorse Hill	63		
86989	Alexandra House, 80 St Johns Road, Altrincham, WA14 2LZ	Bowdon	72	✓	✓
87089	Kilpeacon House, Grey Road, Altrincham, WA14 4BU	Altrincham	101	✓	✓
87174	Dingleside, 46 Arthog Road, Hale Barns, WA15 0LP	Hale Barns	120	✓	✓

87303	Former Crosby Nurseries, Wood Lane, Timperley	Hale Barns	139	✓	✓
87427	58 Stamford Park Road, Altrincham, WA15 9EP	Hale Central	158		
87470	6A Mayfield Road, Timperley, WA15 7SZ	Village	163	✓	✓

Page 1 84072/FUL/2014: The Moose Bar, 193 Ashley Road, Hale

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Christie McDonald
(For Neighbours)**

FOR:

OBSERVATIONS

DESIGN & LAYOUT

1. With regards condition 1 (Approved Plans) drawing reference MSE 1E 100 Proposed External Elevations, was not referred to within the wording of the approved plans condition. An appropriate condition (Condition 4 below) to be included to ensure that the timber fencing as erected on site is retained and maintained in close boarded construction and height as detailed on the approved plans. The applicant has installed the timber cladding to the pilasters either side of the window and premises front elevation. The submitted elevation plan does not however show the cladding on the pilaster adjacent to The Nail Studio (191a Ashley Road). A revised plan will therefore be requested from the applicant through an appropriate condition (Condition 5 below) should planning permission be granted.

RECOMMENDATION

1. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans:- Drawing No:MSE 1E 100 Proposed External Elevations received 22/10/2014; Drawing: Proposed Bin Store/Elevation received 16/09/2015; Drawing: Proposed Bin Store received 11/09/2015 and Drawing: Site Location Plan received 22/10/2014 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
4. The timber close boarded fence as erected to the rear and side boundaries shall be retained and maintained in closed boarded construction and height as detailed on the approved plans.
5. Notwithstanding the detail on the submitted drawings, a revised drawing detailing the cladding to the front elevation of the premises as currently installed on site shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority within

28 days from the granting of planning permission and subsequently approved in writing.

Page 10 85566/FUL/15: Yew Tree Farm, 240 Davyhulme Road, Flixton

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

FOR:

**Kath Ludlam
(Agent)**

REPRESENTATIONS

Two further letters of objection have been received in regards to the amended plans following re-consultation.

One was received from a resident of 155 Woodhouse Road. This letter raises some of the same concerns as outlined in the main report and also raise the following concerns: -

- The proposal would affect their human rights under the Human Rights Act of 1998
- The proposal would result in a loss of light contrary to the Prescription Act of 1832 and the 'right to light' that shall be deemed absolute and indefeasible
- Due to the above, Trafford Council should refuse planning permission.
- Permitted development rights should be removed from the houses by condition, in particular for Plots 4 and 5.
- Fence heights to the boundaries should be 2m.
- Landscaping should include evergreen species on the boundaries of Plots 4 and 5.
- Branley Homes do not own all the land edged in blue.

The other letter of objection was received from a resident of 3 Ryeburn Walk. This letter raises the same concerns as outlined above and in the main report and also raises the following concern: -

- Traffic is a nightmare at weekends with the Meadowside F.C nearby and dangerous parking blocking access roads and cycle paths.

OBSERVATIONS

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Paragraph 8 Amended

The proposed dwellings situated closest to No.155 Woodhouse Road are Plots 4 and 5. Plot 4 would be situated facing east and west. Only part of the rear elevation of Plot 4 would face the side elevation of No. 155 and a minimum

distance of 21m would lie between the rear elevation of Plot 4 and the closest corner of No.155. A minimum distance of 28m would lie between the side elevation of 155 and the side elevation of Plot 5. It is recognised that these distances are also across a public footpath, Bent Lanes, and that the proposed dwellings sit at a higher level than No. 155. Existing mature planting lies along the eastern boundary of the application site, which is proposed to be retained. Dense mature evergreen planting also lies along a significant proportion of the front boundary of No.155, which collectively would screen many views of the proposed development from No.155. Concerns about 'right to light' other than overlooking and overshadowing (material planning considerations) are civil matters and if neighbours have specific concerns, there are civil remedies available. However, given the distance and the orientation of Plots 4 and 5 together with the dense planting along the boundary of the site and that of 155, it is not considered the proposal would result in a detrimental impact in terms of overlooking or overshadowing.

Human Rights

Concerns raised by neighbouring residents are noted, including concerns relating to their human rights. It is considered that the proposed development would not deprive any individual of their home or private and family life and therefore would not result in a breach of human rights.

Land Ownership and Planting

Neighbours have disputed the applicant's ownership of land within the blue edged plan. Whilst the ownership of the full extent of the blue-edged land is not completely clear, it does seem that the applicant has title to most of it. It is considered that sufficient landscaping can be accommodated on this land to ensure a satisfactory development. Accordingly, the landscaping condition (4) has been amended to allow further alterations to the landscaping scheme.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

Affordable Housing Contribution / Viability

Following assessment of the submitted viability appraisal the Council's Estates Section (Amey) concluded it is viable for the development to provide affordable housing in the form of a commuted sum towards the provision of off-site affordable housing provision. Consequently a commuted sum of £22,500 (payable on occupation of the 4th dwelling) was agreed between the parties to deliver new affordable homes, and will be secured via a S106 Agreement.

RECOMMENDATION: MINDED TO GRANT SUBJECT TO LEGAL AGREEMENT

A) That the application will propose a satisfactory form of development for the site upon completion of an appropriate legal agreement to secure a commuted sum of £22,500 towards the delivery of off-site affordable housing provision.

Condition 2 amended

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, number 4020/101 REV K, 4020/110 REV E, 4020/111 REV E, 4020/133 REV C, 4020/002 REV B and 4020/132 REV B.

Condition 4 amended

4. a) Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, the development thereby permitted shall not be carried out until full details of both hard and soft landscaping works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the formation of any banks, terraces or other earthworks, hard surfaced areas and materials, planting plans, specifications and schedules (including planting size, species and numbers/densities), existing plants / trees to be retained and a scheme for the timing / phasing of implementation works.

(b) The landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme for timing / phasing of implementation or within the next planting season following final occupation of the development hereby permitted, whichever is the sooner.

(c) Any trees or shrubs planted or retained in accordance with this condition which are removed, uprooted, destroyed, die or become severely damaged or become seriously diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees or shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted.

Page 25 86115/FUL/15: Bowdon Lawn Tennis Club, Elcho Road, Bowdon

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Jeremy Spencer
(For Neighbours)**

**FOR: Mike Davis
(Applicant)**

REPRESENTATIONS

The following point of objection to be added to the neighbour representations:

- Photometric (lighting) data has been requested by neighbouring residents from the manufacturers. Residents have also asked the Council to request this information from the manufacturers on a number of occasions to allow

the residents' lighting consultant to assess the proposed scheme. The information has not been provided.

- The residents were only told about the date of the planning committee meeting on Friday 4th March and feel aggrieved about the way the application has been dealt with.

OBSERVATIONS

Noise

Paragraph 14 – remove “only times” and replace with “most likely times.”

Lighting

Paragraph 4 main report:

With reference to the abatement notice served on the club, delete paragraph 4 and replace with the following text:

The Council served a nuisance abatement notice on the club to prevent nuisance from the floodlights. This resolved the complaints to the Council in 2012/2013.

A further complaint was received by the Council on January 24th 2015 regarding excessive glare from light. Several temporary lights remained in use on the coaching courts and are used up to 21:30 hours. One particular floodlight was identified which was causing glare. It was agreed that the club would focus attention on this light and work out how to reduce the glare effect being caused. A further visit from Pollution and Licensing was undertaken earlier this year but it was considered that no action was necessary. The notice served on the club is still in place and covers all the courts.

In response to the points raised by the neighbours, Pollution and Licensing have confirmed that the photometric data is not required for their assessment. When considering applications for floodlighting, Pollution and Licensing look at whether the proposed scheme will comply with the ILE guidelines for the relevant environmental zone in terms of the nearest residential receptors. The applicants' lighting scheme includes details of the proposed lighting columns, luminaires and deflectors along with lighting contour drawings to illustrate the spill of light from the floodlights.

Pollution and Licensing consider that sufficient data has been submitted to assess the application. Whilst skyglow is not specifically looked at in terms of amenity, it is considered that the proposal is likely to mitigate skyglow and result in a considerable improvement to the existing temporary moveable lights. It is considered that the proposed lighting scheme will not cause harm to amenity to an extent that would warrant a refusal of planning permission.

The proposal is considered to be acceptable and there is therefore no need to defer this application.

RECOMMENDATION

Condition 1 – remove reference to drawing number 5133-4.

Condition 6 – replace 'courts are' with 'lighting is'.

Page 37 86213/FUL/15: 9-13 Washway Road, Sale

OBSERVATIONS

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

The applicants submitted a viability appraisal and this suggests it would not be viable to provide the one affordable housing unit required by Policy L2 of the Core Strategy. This has been assessed by the Council's Estates Section (Amey) who has queried some of the figures offered as evidence, but nonetheless accept the viability of the scheme to be in serious doubt.

The previous building was in an extremely poor state of repair and its demolition was ultimately advised by the Council due to its dangerous condition. The resultant gap site has since become an unsightly blot on the A56 running through Sale Town Centre and has also left the building on the adjoining site, 15 Washway Road, in a vulnerable state structurally.

Given the exceptional site circumstances referred to above, and the analysis of the viability of the scheme, it is not considered appropriate to seek provision of affordable housing in this case.

RECOMMENDATION : GRANT subject to the following conditions:-

Condition 2 amended

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, number 01 P, 02 P REV A, 03 P REV E, 04 P REV A, 05 P REV B, 06 P REV A and 07 P REV A.

Page 51 86576/OUT/15: Neuholme, Manchester Road, Partington

CONSULTATIONS

Greater Manchester Police Design for Security – No objections, they advise that boundary treatments are important for security and car parking spaces should allow owners clear sight lines over their vehicles. The development should be designed and constructed to Secured by Design standards as developments built to this standard are less likely to be susceptible to crime.

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE

The proposed development would result in the loss of the existing vacant workshop building and therefore the loss of employment floor space. The application site is not allocated as employment land within the UDP Proposals Map and is located within a predominantly residential area. As detailed in paragraph 6 of the Planning Committee Report, the Council cannot at present demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing and therefore there is a clear need for the proposed residential development in this locality, as such the proposed development complies with Policy W1.12 of the Trafford Core Strategy. It is considered that the loss of the employment space would not weigh significantly against the proposed development and therefore the proposal also complies with the NPPF.

Page 63 86904/FUL/15: Cargil, Trafford Park Road, Trafford Park

OBSERVATIONS:

Paragraph 6 should be amended to remove reference to the Bridgewater Canal and replace with the Manchester Ship Canal. Paragraph 6 should read as follows:-

6. The works do however detail the erection of 4no. carbon dioxide storage tanks, these would have a height of 38.8m and would thus be visible from a long range to all sides of the site. Although considered to be large structures, these storage units would not be any different to existing units on the site, which are of a similar scale; many of these are sited along the Manchester Ship Canal running to the rear of the site and thus the new units would be screened from view when viewed from the sites northern side, within Salford's administrative area. The units would also be visible from Guinness Road and the wider area, however given that the wider vicinity of the site comprises of similar industrial and storage uses, and given the number of similar structures within the site itself, the proposed works are considered to be acceptable.

Page 72 86989/FUL/15: Alexandra House, 80 St Johns Road, Altrincham

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	Paulina Lewis (Neighbour)
	FOR:	Tom Flanagan (Agent)

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The proposed development is described in the report as being 41 units, with the accommodation comprising 12 x 2 bed apartments, 23 x 3 bed apartments and 6 x 1 bed mews houses. As a result of the amendments made to the scheme (as described in the report), the scheme has in fact been reduced to 40 units, with the accommodation now comprising 10 x 2 bed apartments, 24 x 3 bed apartments and 6 x 1 bed mews houses.

Further information has been submitted as requested to demonstrate how the proposed apartments would impact on views of St John's Church opposite the site, which is a grade II listed building (paragraph 26 of the report refers). Two key views have been identified; from Ashley Road and Hale Road looking north west and from Albert Square looking north east. A site plan and photographs/image have been submitted.

CONSULTATIONS

GMEU – No objections

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbours - One further letter received from occupiers of Littlemere Court referring to their previous letter and requesting assurance that the issues raised will be addressed at the meeting. The concerns raised are summarised in the representations within the report.

OBSERVATIONS

The amended description of the proposed development is for clarification only and does not affect the assessment of the scheme as summarised in the report. The reduction in the number of units is as a result of increasing the distance retained to the west boundary and improving the design of the front elevation in response to comments raised during consideration of the application.

The further information provided to demonstrate the impact of the development on the setting of St John's Church confirms that the two key views identified would not be adversely affected. The siting of the proposed apartments is such that they would not block existing views of the church from Ashley Road or from Albert Square. The gap retained to the west boundary ensures the existing view of the church steeple from Albert Square is not affected whilst in relation to Ashley Road and Hale Road the set back from this boundary ensures views are not impeded by the apartments. As summarised in the report, the view of the church would in fact be opened up by the proposed removal of trees and vegetation on this side of the site.

Paragraph 51 of the report refers to some of the parking spaces within the proposed basement parking area as being arranged in a tandem layout and the LHA has advised the applicant must ensure that each pair of tandem spaces is

allocated to an individual apartment. It is recommended Condition 9 (requiring the car parking to be provided prior to the development being brought into use and retained thereafter) is amended to also include a requirement for a management plan for the tandem parking to be submitted and approved to ensure this would operate effectively.

It is also recommend Condition 15 (requiring details of how the basement car park will be ventilated) is amended to require the approved ventilation method to be retained once installed.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the conditions set out in the report and Conditions 9 and 15 amended as follows:

9. The car parking, cycle parking, servicing and other vehicular access arrangements shown on the approved plans shall be made fully available for use to serve the development hereby permitted prior to the development being first brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose. A management plan for the tandem parking within the basement parking area shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the development being first brought into use and the spaces shall thereafter be used in accordance with the approved plan.

15. No development shall take place until details of how the basement car park will be ventilated have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved scheme shall be installed as approved and retained thereafter.

Page 101 87089/FUL/15: Kilpeacon House, Grey Road, Altrincham

SPEAKER(S)

AGAINST:

**Neil Baker
(Neighbour)**

FOR:

**George Tsiantar
(Agent)**

CONSULTATIONS

GMEU – No objections

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbours - One further representation received comments summarised as follows: -

1. The proposed plans indicate there will be four floors at the back of the building but the floor plans only show three floors at the front of the

building. The apartments are allocated differently on the two plans submitted.

2. Apart from an elevated view the plans do not show precisely what the rear of the building is going to look like. A further detailed view of the rear of the building should be provided.
3. Request that a preservation order is granted on the Oak tree located in the north corner of the site.

OBSERVATIONS

In response to the above comments:

1. The proposed building does have floors on four different levels, however no part of the building would be four storey. The scheme includes a three storey block to the front part of the site and a two storey block at the rear which would be set into the ground. The plans are annotated correctly.
2. It is considered that a sufficient level of detail has been provided to show the proposed rear elevation. There is a scale drawing of the proposed rear elevation and colour 3D images of this elevation have also been submitted.
3. The issue of making a Tree Preservation Order is separate to the determination of this application, nevertheless the Council's Tree Officer has provided comments in response to this request. The Oak tree in question is shown as being retained on the submitted plans and the proposed building would retain sufficient distance to this tree to ensure it does not need to be removed. As the tree is in a rear garden and not under any sort of threat, it does not satisfy the criteria that LPA's apply when making new Tree Preservation Orders to protect single trees. Those trees should be exceptional specimens, in good health and vigour and highly visible to the public of large. The current Planning Act states that the LPA may make a Tree Preservation Order if it is 'expedient in the interests of amenity' to do so and in this case it is considered the criteria would not be met.

The report refers to the submitted plans including a cycle store within the site and the application form confirms 16 spaces will be provided (which would comply with the Council's standards), however the plan doesn't actually specify this number of spaces. For the avoidance of any doubt and to ensure the required amount of cycle parking is provided it is recommended Condition 9 is amended to include specific requirement for this number of spaces.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the conditions set out in the report and Condition 9 amended as follows:

9. The car parking, cycle parking, servicing and other vehicular access arrangements shown on the approved plans shall be made fully available for use to serve the development hereby permitted prior to the development being first brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose. The cycle parking shall provide a minimum 16 spaces.

Page 120 87174/FUL/15: Dingleside, 46 Arthog Road, Hale Barns

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	Richard Dyson (Neighbour)
	FOR:	Kath Ludlam (Agent)

OBSERVATIONS

The submitted bat survey indicates that evidence of 2 species of bats was found in both the garage building to be demolished and the main building to be converted, in the form of droppings. Since evidence of bats has been found on this site then under the terms of the Habitats Directive and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended), which enacts the Directive into the UK, a licence may be required from Natural England before any work can commence that may disturb bats. Before a licence can be granted three tests must be satisfied. These are:

- I. That the development is “in the interest of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequence of primary importance for the environment”;
- II. That there is “no satisfactory alternative”;
- III. That the derogation is “not detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range”.

In considering planning applications that may affect European Protected Species, Local Planning Authorities are bound by Regulation 9(1) and 9(5) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 to have regard to the Habitats Directive when exercising their function. Government Circular 05/06 gives guidance to local authorities on how these issues should be considered. All three tests must be satisfied before planning permission is granted on a site.

With regards point one the application proposes a development that will create employment opportunities and increase housing numbers within the locality. The development will also assist in the long term retention of the main building which is identified as a positive contributor to the conservation area.

With regards point two, it is not considered that there is an alternative way to achieve this development given the sensitivity of the Conservation Area location. The garage building to be demolished has little architectural or historic merit and due to its proximity to the main house, redevelopment in this location minimises the impact on the spaciousness of the site and also minimises the loss of trees and shrubs. The conversion of the main building also proposes minimal external physical alteration to the historic property (a positive contributor to the conservation area).

As regards the third test the GMEU have commented that the bat species involved are among the most common, the roosts involved appear to be only day roosts and the number of bats involved is small. They also consider that the outline mitigation proposals put forward by the bat consultants in their report provide a sound basis for a license application and the recommended condition will ensure that no development shall commence until Natural England have either issued a licence or confirmed in writing that it is not required.

It is noted in GMEU's consultation response that they consider it likely that a bat license will be granted by Natural England, should this be necessary.

Page 139 87303/FUL/15: Former Crosby Nurseries, Wood Lane, Timperley

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	Mrs Hainsworth-Walsh (Neighbour)
	FOR:	Mike Stone (Applicant)

REPRESENTATIONS

An additional objection has been received from one of the objectors who lives on Drayton Grove and this relates to the comments made by Cllr Butt and some objectors in relation to their request that the existing access road be used as an exit route from the new development. Additional issues raised summarised below:-

- The volume of traffic on the road is currently very low and the presence of HGVs only tends to occur at certain times of the year. Using the road as part of the new development would result in a much higher volume of traffic passing between the rear gardens of Faulkner Drive and Drayton Grove.
- HGVs that use the access road have to travel very slowly to avoid contact with the garden fences or slipping off the tarmac surface.
- It is doubted if the access road at its narrowest point is wide enough to accommodate both a walkway and a road wide enough for emergency vehicles
- It is agreed that use of the access road is better from a crime point of view than simply blocking off the road, but the increase in traffic would raise other

issues for the properties backing onto it. For example, maintenance of rear fences.

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has requested that the wording of two of the conditions be amended as set out below and the Lead Local Flood Authority and Pollution and Licensing Section have confirmed that they have no objection to the proposed amendments.

In addition the applicant has requested that condition 13 be removed as discharge via infiltration is not required as a result of the approved drainage layout and agreed discharge rate set out in condition 12 and again this has been agreed by the Lead Local Flood Authority

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

Delete the following condition:

13. Permeable Surfacing

Amend the following conditions to read:

9. Prior to the first use of occupation of any part of the development hereby approved, the approved Remediation and Enabling Works Strategy (ref E3P Report: 10-787-R2, December 2015) shall be carried out to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. Once complete, a Site Completion Report detailing the conclusions and actions taken at each stage of the works (including validation works) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA on a plot by plot completion basis.

12. The development hereby permitted shall have a Peak discharge rate to be 50 l/s (in accordance with Level 2 SFRA) and the proposed drainage strategy to be generally in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment - Ref: HYD051_FRA

Page 163 87470/FUL/16: 6A Mayfield Road, Timperley

SPEAKER(S)

AGAINST:

**Chris Walters
(Neighbour)**

FOR:

**James Hindley
(Agent)**

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbours:

8 further objections received. The following additional comments are as follows:

- Windows facing the proposed development are not obscured and overlook application site
- Impact upon light and privacy
- Proposed development not in keeping for residential area
- Roof would look more industrial than domestic
- Proposed development would be over dominant
- Lack of communication from Council as previous application was not going to be a Committee item

Consultation

Drainage - Advises that peak discharge rate of storm water from this development should be within limits indicated within the Guidance Document to the Manchester City, Salford City and Trafford Councils Level 2 Hybrid strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

OBSERVATIONS

No further observations are made with respect to the proposed development.

RECOMMENDATION

Replace condition 9 in the main report with the following wording:

No development shall take place unless and until full details of works to limit the proposed peak discharge rate of storm water from the development to meet the requirements of the Council's level 2 Hybrid Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be brought into use until such works as approved are implemented in full and they shall be retained and maintained to a standard capable of limiting the peak discharge rate as set out in the SFRA thereafter.

**HELEN JONES, DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND CORPORATE DIRECTOR,
ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT:

**Rebecca Coley, Head of Planning and Development, Planning Department,
1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH
Telephone 0161 912 3149**