

AGENDA ITEM 3

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 14th July 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.
86620	Land adjacent to 74 Ridgeway Road, Timperley, WA15 7HD	Hale Barns	1		✓
86625	Clay Lane Sports Club, Clay Lane, Timperley, WA15 7AF	Hale Barns	18		✓
87339	Land encompassing 26A Marsland Road, Warrener Street Car Park & IMO Car Wash Site Sale	Sale Moor	37	✓	✓
87811	11/13 Raglan Road, Sale, M33 4AN	Brooklands	78	✓	
87933	Land to the rear of 247 Hale Road, Hale Barns, WA15 8RE	Hale Barns	97	✓	✓
88092	1A Sinderland Road, Altrincham WA14 5EU	Broadheath	120		✓
88172	24 Hillington Road, Sale, M33 6GP	Ashton on Mersey	132	✓	✓
88279	Site of former MKM House, Warwick Road, Stretford, M16 0XX	Longford	140		✓
88319	1 Craddock Road, Sale, M33 3QQ	Brooklands	165		✓

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

**FOR: Mark Jordan
(For Applicant)**

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

Paragraph 8 amended to read - Recent case law has established that a development plan should be considered to be out of date in respect of any policies which seek to restrict new housing development where that authority does not have a deliverable five year housing land supply. As the Council doesn't have this deliverable five year housing land supply at present, it can be argued that the Council's Green Belt Policy R4 is out of date in relation to proposals for new housing in the Green Belt. Nevertheless, even if the policy is technically 'out of date' it remains in accordance with current government policy in the NPPF on the protection of Green Belt land. The weight it can be given therefore remains significant. In any event the NPPF, as a primary material consideration, would apply the same test of very special circumstances outweighing the identified harm to the Green Belt and any other harm in order to find this proposal acceptable. The NPPF states that the essential characteristics of Green Belt are their openness and their permanence. The relevant case law is now subject to challenge in the Supreme Court.

RECOMMENDATION:

Condition 2 - The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans:-

- Drawing No: (EX)002 Rev.A - Existing Site Plan
- Drawing No: (PL)200 Rev.A - Street Scene
- Drawing No: (PL)004 Rev.A - Floor Plans
- Drawing No: (PL)005 Rev.A - Elevations
- Drawing No: (PL)300 Rev.A - Proposed Site Plan

Reason: To clarify the permission, having regard to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy.

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

**FOR: Mark Jordan
(Applicant)**

CONSULTATIONS

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) – Further comments received from the GMEU confirm that floodlight lighting restrictions (i.e hours of use of the floodlighting as indicated under proposed condition 10) should apply throughout the entire year and not just the rugby union season which occurs generally between September – May inclusive.

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

Paragraph 13 amended to read - The proposed works to the car-park involve resurfacing and demarcating parking spaces on an area of hard-core and therefore would have no additional impact on the Green Belt. The land is already used for car parking.

PROTECTED OPEN SPACE

Paragraph 16 – amended to read - The site is allocated as Protected Open Space on the Revised UDP map. Core Strategy Policy R5 seeks to protect areas of Protected Open Space. Development that results in an unacceptable loss of quantity of open space, sport or recreational facilities, or does not preserve the quality of such facilities will not be permitted. Whilst the proposed clubhouse extensions will increase the floorspace of built form within an area of Protected Open Space, it is considered that the development proposals will result in an improvement in sports facilities at the club, the benefits of which will outweigh the harm caused by the loss of the open space. Advice contained within the NPPF (Paragraph 74) states that ‘existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including fields should not be built on unless the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location’. The extensions to the club house will provide upgraded club house and changing room facilities that are considered to reflect the above guidance. The proposed development is therefore considered to be in accordance with Core Strategy Policy R5 and advice contained within the NPPF.

IMPACT OF FLOODLIGHTING ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Paragraph 24 amended to read - Some residents will experience a degree of light pollution from the existing floodlighting provision at the site and also from the adjacent uses. The proposal will involve columns that are larger than the existing and therefore more visible from a distance. However, the design of the floodlighting columns, the low lux levels and degree of light spill, and the restriction on use (they will be conditioned to be switched off no later than 2130hrs), all means that the impact on residential amenity will be limited. Whilst some residents will be able to see the ‘box of light’ resulting from the development, it is not considered that the properties will be affected by light spill to an extent that it would be harmful to their amenity to a level which would warrant a refusal of planning permission. A suitable planning condition will

ensure that the lighting scheme that is implemented will incorporate protection against glare for nearby residents.

RECOMMENDATION

Condition 4 - The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans:-

- Drawing No:-E4162 - SK005 Rev.A - Proposed Site Plan
- Drawing No:- E4162 - SK006 Rev.A - Part Site Plan Showing Proposed Car-Park & Pitch
- Drawing No:-E4162-SK007 - Proposed Clubhouse Extension Layout
- Drawing No UKS11477 - External Floodlighting (Abacus Lighting)
- Drawing No:- HL250D15/2/AL5760 - Mast

Reason: To clarify the permission, having regard to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy.

Condition 16. No development shall commence unless and until a scheme for cycle storage has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the development is brought into use and shall be retained at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that appropriate cycle provision is incorporated into the scheme at design stage in order to promote sustainable forms of transport in accordance with Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and advice within the NPPF.

Page 37 87339/FUL/15: Land encompassing 26A Marsland Road, Warrener Street Car Park & IMO Car Wash Site, Sale

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	Martin Tonks Planning Consultants (For Neighbours)
	FOR:	Stella Millner (Neighbour)

PROPOSAL

Amended and Additional Plans

Further amended plans have been received. This includes an amended Proposed Site Plan to include amended 5 staff only car parking spaces to the south of the site and trees proposed to be retained at the site. Additionally an updated swept path analysis drawing has been submitted to reflect the amended 5 staff only car parking spaces to the south of the site.

In addition to the above, the applicants have submitted a written response from their appointed Traffic Engineers, to address the concerns raised in the submitted Sale Moor Community Planning Group Objection.

REPRESENTATIONS

OBJECTIONS

Amended Paragraph

To date, 405 letters and emails of objection have been received from local residents, businesses, Sale Moor Community Planning Group, a ward councillor and a neighbouring ward councillor on behalf of councillors for neighbouring wards. The concerns raised are summarised below:

Further Representations Received

In addition to those already reported in the committee report, a further 30 further letters of objection have been received from local residents. These raised many of the same concerns as already outlined in the committee report. Further issues raised are summarised as follows:

- The data used to assess the traffic impact is out of date and from 2006-07.
- Warrener Street would become a drop off area for taxis bringing unwanted pedestrian and vehicle traffic.
- The turning head on Warrener Street will be a danger to existing residents as a result of cars turning.
- Shopkeepers will be forced to park on side streets with the loss of the car park.
- Construction of the store will cause chaos in the surrounding area.
- Sale Moor is a village and a supermarket will ruin the village feel of Sale Moor.
- Comments related to the sale and value of the Trafford owned portion of the site.
- Comments asking the Council to impose a minimum timescale on any resubmission of a similar planning application for this site within the next 10 years.
- We are Sale Moor Community Group members claim they want the Sale Moor Village to have independent shops, markets, community events and meeting places, a safe and enjoyable night life and safer traffic. The proposal does not deliver any of these aims.
- Further concern expressed about the traffic implications of the proposals and impact on highway and pedestrian safety from traffic generation associated with the proposal. Have the Local Highway Authority witnessed the traffic generation at weekends and peak times?

- Safety concerns expressed regarding small children in the village and the impact of the proposed foodstore entrance and associated traffic on their safety.
- The supporting documents submitted by the applicant suggest the proposal is consistent with Government's town centre first approach. However Sale Moor is not a town centre.
- Local jobs could be negatively impacted as a result of the proposal having a detrimental impact on the existing traders in the village.
- Given the sheer number of people in the local community against this proposal, concern is raised about the impact on the community should the build go ahead.

In addition to the above mentioned letters of objection received, an online petition has been received. The petition gathered over 1500 signatures and comments. The comments received through this petition reiterate the many concerns already raised and summarised above and reported in the committee report.

Two further letters of support have been received. These outlined the same reasons for support as already reported in the committee report.

OBSERVATIONS

HIGHWAYS AND CAR PARKING

Paragraph 55

A further amended swept path analysis drawing has been submitted since the committee report was published. The 5 car parking spaces identified for staff parking only have been amended to ensure these spaces work independently and the layout of the car parking spaces changed. The LHA consider the proposed amended layout to be acceptable.

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 plan, 10628-001; 10628-106 Rev J; 10628-114 Rev B; 10628-115; 10628-109 Rev E; 10628-112 Rev C; 10628-111 Rev A; 10628-110 Rev C and TPMA 1256-100 Rev E.

Reason: To clarify the permission, having regard to Policies L1, L2, L4, L5, L, L8, R2, W1 and W2 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 17 amended

17. The car parking, servicing and vehicular access arrangements shown on the approved plans to serve the development hereby permitted shall be provided and made fully available for use prior to the component of the development to which they relate (foodstore or dwellings) being occupied and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in compliance with Trafford Core Strategy Policies L4 and L7 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 19 amended

19. Prior to the opening of the foodstore, a detailed scheme for the provision of the offsite highway works identified on drawing number TPMA 1256-100 Rev. E comprising the provision of enhanced pedestrian crossing facilities and traffic calming features at the Northenden Road gyratory junction immediately east of the site and localised widening of the Northenden Road westbound carriageway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in full in accordance with the approved details prior to the first opening to the public of the retail foodstore hereby approved.

Reason: To facilitate access for pedestrians and encourage sustainable modes of travel in accordance with Trafford Core Strategy Policies L4 and L7 of and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 28 amended

28. No development or works of site preparation shall take place until, a detailed scheme of fox mitigation measures (including how foxes are to be excluded from any existing earth) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme of mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with approved details thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard any protected species which may either live or forage within the site and which could be harmed at the outset of development works commencing on site in accordance with Policy R2 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 29 - Additional Condition

29. No development shall take place until a survey to determine the presence of any of protected species under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), in the application site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The identity of the qualified person(s) undertaking that survey shall first be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. If any protected species is found to either reside or forage within the site, no development shall take place until a scheme for the protection of their

Additional pressure on services:

The erection of 4no. 2 bedroom housing units, in this instance, is not considered to materially pressurise the existing broadband and water services within the area. Especially when considering that the development would be built within a well-established urban area. It should further be noted that United Utilities lodged no objections to the proposed development, when consulted by the Council.

Delete Para. 12 and replace with:

12. Raglan Road and its surrounding area remain largely diverse in terms of building styles and types, presenting a wide mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings, along with a number of apartment blocks and commercial sites; these are largely built at two storey level and present a mix of building materials and boundary treatments. The area is also not absent from the sub-division of existing plots, with the closest example being that of number 15 Raglan Road, sited to the application sites north-eastern side, with its access running along the sites eastern side boundary.

RECOMMENDATION:

Replace **condition 7** with:

- 7 Notwithstanding the approved drawing the openings on the rear (north-west) elevation of no. 11-13 Raglan Road at third and fourth floors levels, shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter. Furthermore no further windows or openings shall be formed within the rear north-western elevation unless planning permission for such development has been granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of protecting residential amenity and in compliance with Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Replace **condition 8** with:

- 8 Prior to the first occupation of any of the residential units hereby approved, full details of the cycle storage sheds shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the dimension, siting and layout of the cycle storage shed, including the number of cycles it can hold and should also include the full specification of the materials to be used externally for the cycle store. Prior to the first occupation of any of the residential units hereby approved, the cycle storage shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and then be retained at all times thereafter.

Reason: In order to promote sustainable modes of transport in compliance with Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 1: New Residential Development (2004).

Page 97 87933/FUL/16: Land to the rear of 247 Hale Road, Hale Barns

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	Rob McLoughlin (Neighbour)
	FOR:	Gareth Salthouse Emery Planning (For Applicant)

OBSERVATIONS

Replace **paragraph 38** with:

38. It is considered a reasonable argument that this piece of land is an anomaly left after previous developments to the rear of No's 247-251 Hale Road situated at the edge of the South Hale Conservation Area. For this reason it is considered that the loss of part of the garden area of 247 Hale Road would result in some impact on the character and spaciousness of the area for the reasons set out above. The assessment below will consider if this is harmful or not.

For clarification regarding paragraph 60 of the report. The Council's Senior Planner (Arboriculture) has confirmed that verbal agreement was given to remove the trees subject to suitable replacement planting. A suitable landscaping scheme, to include replacement trees, is required by recommended condition 4.

RECOMMENDATION:

Delete **Condition 7**

Replace **Condition 9** with:

- 9 Notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) no buildings, extensions or alterations permitted by Classes A, B, D, E and F of Part 1 and Class A of Part 2 of the Second Schedule shall be carried out, unless planning permission for such development has been granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect neighbour amenity and the character and appearance of site and Conservation Area, having regards to Policies L7 and R1 of the Trafford Core Strategy.

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

**FOR: Gary Sutton
(Agent)**

OBSERVATIONS

4. Further to this the development would bring back into use a large vacant unit. The change of use to a take away within the A5 use class would reinstate an active frontage on this prominent junction and the Sinderland Road street-scene. It is therefore considered that the development would have a positive impact on the wider area, adding to the vitality and vibrancy of the mixed use area within Altrincham, complying with the relevant policies from the NPPF and policy W1 and W2 of the TBC Core strategy.

PARKING AND HIGHWAYS

Delete Para's 21-23 and replace with:

21. The Councils adopted SPD3 Parking Standards and Design for Trafford states that for an A5 use (Hot Food Takeaways) in this area, 1 space per 6 sqm of public floor space should be provided. The proposed development has a gross floor space of 186 sqm, with a public floor area of 39sqm, hence, in accordance with SPD3, 6.5 parking spaces are required. The proposed development proposes no off street parking provision for the use of staff or customers.
22. It should however be noted that, there is no existing, allocated parking provision at the existing site. However, un-restricted on-street parking is available in close proximity to the site on Huxley Street and there are also 5 off-street parking spaces which are marked out at the turning head of Huxley Street to the east of the site. Under the sites existing use, a tile and bathroom outlet (class A1 non-food retail), the parking requirements would have been 1 space per 21 sqm which would be greater than the use, as currently proposed, at between 8 – 9 spaces. It should further be noted that as the site currently has an A1 use, the site could be converted into a more intensive retail use, such as food retail, which would require a greater number of parking spaces, under the Councils adopted SPD3 Guidelines, at around 13 spaces, double that of the use as currently proposed.
23. Therefore, in this instance, it has been considered that given the nature of the proposed use of the site, as a takeaway, it is unlikely that the site would require a high level of parking spaces. If driving, most customers are likely to be arriving to collect an order and would not require a parking

space for any significant length of time. In addition, it is likely that the peak parking demand for the site would be in the evening, which is usually a quieter period of day, with less pressure on the existing on street parking provision within the sites immediate vicinity. As such, the availability of parking on Huxley Street is deemed sufficient for the predicted customer requirements and it is considered unlikely that the change of use of the site would generate a significant increase in traffic to the site overall. In addition, given that the site is located in close proximity to public transport links (bus), the Local Highways Authority are also content with the proposals and have raised no objection to this application, on parking and highway grounds.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to the following conditions:

Please delete condition 6:

Page 132 88172/HHA/16: 24 Hillington Road, Sale

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	John Hemsworth (Neighbour)
	FOR:	Tom Stanway (Applicant)

Page 140 88279/FUL/16: Site of former MKM House, Warwick Road, Stretford

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	
	FOR:	Richard Gee (Agent)

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 a maximum financial contribution of £51,381 towards improvements to Gorse Hill Park comprising: £22,202 towards Local Open Space and £29,179 towards play provision; and
- (B) In the circumstances where the S106 Agreement has not been completed within three months of the resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Head of Planning Services; and
- (C) That upon satisfactory completion of the above legal agreement, planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions: -

Amend the following Condition:

18. Prior to the first occupation of any part of the development, 89 cycle spaces for residents, and spaces for visitors in a convenient location close to the building entrance, shall be provided in accordance with approved plans PL(00)004, PL(00)024 and PL(00)25. The cycle parking shall be retained at all times thereafter, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure sufficient cycle parking provision is provided within the development in the interests of promoting sustainable modes of travel and to comply with Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Standards and Design.

Page 165 88319/HHA/16: 1 Craddock Road, Sale

SPEAKER(S)

AGAINST:

FOR:

**Belinda Wong
(Applicant)**

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant for the above application has submitted comments in response to representations made in relation to the development. The points made in this are summarised below.

- We believed the extension would be permitted development, unfortunately this was incorrect.
- The Building Control Inspector dealing with building regulations did not advise that the extension was not permitted development.
- We would not have started the proposed development had we known from the outset that this needed full plans approval.
- We were not initially made aware that 24 Norris Road also had reservations. The design of the build was altered to incorporate windows in the side elevation at the request of 24 Norris Road. We would like to note that this was done at significant extra expense to us.
- We were led to believe by these detailed discussions with 24 Norris Road that they had no objections so we decided to continue the development.
- We would like to note that our closest neighbours at 3 Craddock Road do not have any objections, and have fully supported us throughout this whole process.

- Despite the initial error with whether the proposed development could process under permitted development guidelines, we feel this application must be considered on its planning merits just in the same way as any other application.
- The previous extension of a part first floor, part two storey, and rear double storey extension is not up for discussion, and had full plans approval in 2009.
- The proposed extension has been designed to be subordinate to the main dwelling being only 39m², which is in proportion with the rest of the dwelling with a total floor space of 190m². This is not disproportionate.
- The materials that have been used match the existing house. The house as a whole is in keeping with the character of this part of Craddock Road. There is sufficient space to the rear of the property to provide us the sufficient private amenity space, and does not appear cramped or affect spaciousness.
- The development would include a window in the side elevation. These windows are opaque/satin glass (obscured level 5), and they are above head height at 1.7m from the floor. They cannot be seen through at ground level. Therefore, there is no direct line of sight into the neighbouring property, and there is no unacceptable overlooking or privacy issues with the neighbouring properties.
- At midday, the shadow line from the proposed extension extends halfway up the garden fence on the neighbouring common boundary of 24 Norris Road, and does not whatsoever extend into the rear of the neighbouring garden, nor into the neighbouring windows.
- The blank gable wall that faces 24 Norris Road was built as part of a full plans application in 2009, and was built well before they bought the house, and their own subsequent extension. Furthermore, a row of mature screening trees in the rear of the garden at 24 Norris Road, was removed by the current owners, and has not been replaced.
- The proposed extension does not span the complete width of the rear garden at 24 Norris Road. In fact, the majority of the width of the rear garden at 24 Norris Road is spanned by the previous extension.
- We have no plans to erect a conservatory in the future, as the proposed extension will give us all the living space we require.
- We are minded that this application has been supported following due planning process and SPD4 planning guidance, and in addition, has the full support of Cllr Dixon.

The above comments do not affect the recommendation made in the Officer's report.

**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,
1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall,
Talbot Road,
Stretford,
M32 0TH.
Telephone: 0161 912 3149**