

PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT CONTROL) COMMITTEE – 9<sup>th</sup> May 2013

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	For
78926	100 Washway Road, Sale, M33 7RE	Ashton on Mersey	1		
80100	Land between 182 and 182a Park Road, Stretford, M32 0AS	Gorse Hill	10		
80141	Grove House, Skerton Road, Old Trafford, M16 0WJ	Longford	25		
80160	29 Bamber Avenue, Sale, M33 2TH	Sale Moor	35		
80189	300-302 Stretford Road, Urmston, M41 9WL	Urmston	39		
80218	Bankhall Day Nursery & Nursery School, 60 Bankhall Lane, Hale, WA15 0LG	Hale Barns	51		
80381	4 Teesdale Avenue, Davyhulme, M41 8BY	Davyhulme West	58		
Agenda Item No. 5					
80337	Site of Former 23-49 Woodfield Road, Altrincham, WA14 4ET	Altrincham			

**SPEAKER(S)**

**AGAINST:**

**FOR:**

**George Stevenson  
(on behalf of Agent)**

#### **DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS**

The applicant has submitted a viability assessment in relation to the developer contributions required in accordance with SPD1. The Council has not been able to fully consider this submission yet and therefore the applicant has requested that this application is deferred to a later Planning Committee meeting to enable this matter to be fully and accurately considered.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

If the Planning Committee is minded to determine the planning application, is it recommended that the following conditions are added to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents and the future occupants of the proposed development:

10. No use of the flat roof areas as a balcony or terrace.
11. Retention of privacy screens to the rear elevation.
12. Submission of a scheme for crime reduction measures.

#### **Page 25 80141/FULL/2013: Grove House, Skerton Road, Old Trafford**

A revised parking layout has been received in respect of the aisle widths to the parking bays. This revised parking layout has therefore reduced the number of parking spaces to 107 which is in accordance with the maximum car parking provision recommended in the Core Strategy.

The applicant has also now submitted a noise assessment which confirms that noise levels at the site were measured over a 24 hour period from a position facing the industrial site opposite. The report has considered the results against noise assessment guidance within the previous national guidance set out in PPG 24 (now superseded by the NPPF).

The site would fall within Noise Exposure Category B for daytime and night time noise levels. In relation to NEC B, previous guidance within PPG24 stated that noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications and, where appropriate conditions imposed to ensure an adequate level of protection against noise.

The applicant then looks to guidance contained within BS8233:1999 in relation to reasonable standards of sound insulation and mitigation measures regarding double glazing and acoustic trickle vents which will allow ventilation without the need to open windows. Externally the noise assessment notes that the scheme does not include balconies or areas of external amenity space.

The noise assessment concludes that the site is suitable for the proposed residential use with the recommended noise measures.

## **CONSULTATIONS**

LHA – The LHA are now satisfied with revised parking arrangements.

### **Pollution & Licensing**

The Environmental Health Officer has commented that the noise assessment does not include specific assessment of noise from CSM Ltd and this should be carried out. Furthermore, it is not clear from the noise assessment what specification of double glazing will meet the required sound insulation performance and whether this will be applied to the whole façade. Further detail is also required in relation to the proposed trickle vents and the mitigation measures may need to be reviewed in light of further assessment of noise from CSM Ltd.

Therefore the noise assessment that has been submitted cannot be accepted at this stage.

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

A further letter of objection has been received on behalf of CSM Ltd who occupy the site opposite. The letter states that the noise report has been received only 2 days before the Committee meeting which provides insufficient opportunity to take technical advice in order to respond properly. Nevertheless, it is noted that;

- Measurements were only taken for a 24 hour period
- The day time external noise level was 61DB and the night time noise level was 55DB
- The NEC Category B noise levels for day time were 55 to 63DB and the NEC Category B night time levels are 45 – 57DB.
- Therefore the daytime and night time noise readings are at the upper end of NEC category B and any further increase in the working practices of CSM'S site could push the background noise levels into Category C where it is considered that planning permission should not normally be granted.

The letter states that CSM may increase loading and unloading on the site which could include night time loading and unloading and if this were to happen it would seem very likely that the NEC category would be C rather than Category B. Therefore complaints from future residents or further restrictions could harm the existing business at the CSM site and prevent future expansion plans.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

The revised parking layout has now addressed the issues set out in the Officer report in terms of the LHA comments regarding overprovision of car parking and substandard aisle widths. An appropriate level of car parking at 107 spaces is now provided and the access arrangements within the site are acceptable.

The reduction in the level of car parking provision has now allowed for two meaningful areas of landscaping at the front of the building adjacent to the boundary with Skerton Road. Subject to requiring a detailed landscape scheme by condition, it is considered that this will be a significant improvement to the visual amenity of the site.

In terms of the noise assessment submitted, whilst this cannot be accepted due to the comments raised by Pollution and Licensing in respect of the additional criteria which needs to be taken into account, it is considered that the recommendation within the Officer Report which recommends that Members delegate approval to the Chief Planning

Officer will allow for a more detailed noise assessment to be submitted to address these issues and details of sound insulation measures can ensure a satisfactory level of amenity for future occupiers and to ensure that the change of use does not prejudice the continued operation of the CSM site opposite.

In relation to the objections from CSM, it is accepted that further noise assessment is required in relation to the CSM site and acceptance of the applicant's noise assessment would be subject to the advice of Pollution and Licensing based on the findings of the noise report and the suitability of the mitigation measures, and it is on this basis that Members are asked to delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Minded to Grant, subject to a legal agreement and satisfactory noise assessment.

- (A) That the application will propose a satisfactory form of development for the site upon receipt of a satisfactory noise assessment and completion of an appropriate legal agreement to secure the provision of 3 affordable units and to secure a maximum financial contribution of £268,974.39 split between: £116,250.09 towards Spatial Green Infrastructure, Sports and Recreation; and £152,724.30 towards Education Facilities.
- (B) In the circumstances where a satisfactory noise assessment has not been received and the Section 106 Agreement has not been completed within 3 months of this resolution, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer.
- (C) That upon satisfactory completion of the above legal agreement and receipt of satisfactory noise assessment, planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:-
1. Time Limit
  2. Details in accordance with approved plans
  3. Scheme for sound insulation measures
  4. Revised car parking arrangements to be laid out in accordance with approved plans and available for use prior to occupation
  5. Submission of travel plan
  6. Details of cycle parking provision
  7. Details of motor cycle parking
  8. Landscaping details and implementation
  9. Details of all infill cladding panels to be submitted and agreed
  10. Colour of replacement windows to be agreed in writing
  11. Scheme for crime reduction measures

**Page 35 80160/HHA/2013: 29 Bamber Avenue, Sale**

Amendment to description: should read Erection of a part two storey, part single storey side extension and single storey rear extension.

**Observations**

**Residential Amenity**

The neighbour at 31 Bamber Avenue has confirmed that there is a second window serving the kitchen, in the rear elevation overlooking the garden. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not unduly reduce the light to the kitchen such as a refusal of planning consent would be justified.

**Page 39 80189/FULL/2013: 300-302 Stretford Road, Urmston**

**SPEAKER(S)**

**AGAINST:**

**FOR:**

**Lucy Hawley  
(on behalf of Applicant)**

**CONSULTATIONS**

Asset Management have now confirmed that the applicant’s revised viability appraisal for the 24 apartments has shown that the scheme is unable to support any s106 contributions or provision of affordable housing. However any permission should be subject to legal agreement to secure overage arrangements should the final scheme produce a level of profit above the standard rate of 20% as set out in the recommendation.

**REPRESENTATIONS**

1 further letter of objection has been received on the grounds that from the amended plans it appears that one of the proposed blocks will cover the entire rear of 4 Anchorage Road and will block natural light.

**OBSERVATIONS**

In terms of the relationship to No. 4 Anchorage Road, this is set out in paragraphs 20 and 21 of the committee report and the proposal is considered to be an acceptable relationship due to the separation distance to this boundary and the existing trees to be retained.

It should be noted that there is an error in the committee report at para 11, the final sentence should refer to the proposal no longer included windows within the third floor side elevation.

**CONDITIONS**

An additional condition is recommended for details of levels of the proposed development to be submitted and approved in writing prior to commencement of development.

**Page 51 80218/FULL/2013: Bankhall Day Nursery & Nursery School, 60 Bankhall Lane, Hale**

**SPEAKER(S)**

**AGAINST:**

**FOR:**

**Paul Carr**

(on behalf of Agent)

**Page 58 80381/HHA/2013: 4 Teesdale Avenue, Davyhulme**

This application was withdrawn by the applicant on 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2013.

**Agenda Item No 5. 80337/FULL/2013: Site of Former 23-49 Woodfield Road, Altrincham**

### **APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION**

The applicant has submitted amended plans as anticipated in the report. In summary the amended plans reduce the height of the proposed dwellings, amend the roof design so all dwellings have gabled roofs and amend the elevations of the elements at the side of the detached units to brick rather than render as originally proposed.

### **CONSULTATIONS**

**United Utilities** – No objection provided the following conditions are met: -

- A public sewer crosses the site and building over it will not be permitted. Access strip width of 6 metres, 3 metres either side of the centre line of the sewer will be required.
- The site must be drained on a separate system, with only foul drainage connected into the foul sewer. Surface water should discharge to a SUDS system to meet the requirements of the NPPF.
- No surface water to be discharged either directly or indirectly to the combined network.

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

**Neighbours** – Two further letters received summarised as follows: -

- Concern that yet more housing is to be introduced to Woodfield Road and will impact on parking which is already an issue.
- Any green space in the area is quickly disappearing. It would be of greater benefit to residents in the area to keep the small area of ground as a small green area/park or a community garden. Loss of amenity as this land is used by dog walkers, children, etc.
- Proposal will affect the view and amount of natural daylight to a side window of No. 21 Woodfield Road (which serves a dining room). The outline application was for 2 storey development but this application is for 2.5 storey development and will exclude all natural light from that room in the evening. The developer should amend the scheme to a two storey dwelling or not develop up to this end of the site.
- The proposed 2.1m high fence up to the corner of the road will reduce visibility for drivers coming out of Princes Road onto Woodfield Road and cause a serious hazard.
- The reduction in available street parking and the additional demand will have a serious detrimental effect on residents.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

The amended plans reduce the height of the dwellings from 10.3m to 9.4m (primarily by lowering the ridge but also including a small reduction in eaves height). In comparison to the terraced properties fronting Woodfield Road on either side of the site the dwellings would be approximately 800mm higher. The roof design has also been amended so all eight dwellings have gabled roofs rather than some having a half-hipped design. This side of Woodfield Road comprises predominantly two storey dwellings of similar height to that now proposed and have gabled roofs and in this context it is considered the reduced height and amended roof design of the proposed dwellings would have acceptable impact within the street scene. The amendment to replace the proposed render to the set back sections with brick is also considered an improvement to the design.

The proposed boundary treatment on the Princes Road side of the site (alongside plot 8) has been amended from a 2.1m high fence along the majority of this boundary to a hedge for approximately half its length from the junction and a 1.8m high fence to the remainder which is predominantly along the boundary to the garden of this plot.

With regards to the representation received regarding the impact on 21 Woodfield Road, the proposed dwelling opposite this property (plot 8) would be 18m from its side elevation. The Council's guideline for new residential development require 15m to be retained between a main elevation facing a two storey blank gable and the proposal therefore meets this guideline. Although the side elevation of No. 21 is not a 'main' elevation (the main elevations being to the front and rear) it is acknowledged it has a main window to this elevation and 15m is considered the appropriate guideline. It is further acknowledged the proposed dwelling would be slightly higher than a conventional two storey dwelling and therefore it is reasonable to assume a distance in excess of 15m ought to be retained, which in this case it is considered an additional 3 metres would be sufficient to avoid unacceptable overshadowing. There are no windows proposed in the side elevation of plot 8 that may otherwise have overlooked 21 Woodfield Road.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

No change to recommendation, subject to the following additional conditions: -

11. Crime prevention plan to be submitted and approved
12. Access strip width of 6 metres, 3 metres either side of the centre line of the sewer.
13. Site must be drained on a separate system, with only foul drainage connected into the foul sewer. Surface water should discharge to a SUDS system to meet the requirements of the NPPF.
14. No surface water is discharged either directly or indirectly to the combined network.

**HELEN JONES  
CORPORATE DIRECTOR  
ECONOMIC GROWTH & PROSPERITY**

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT:  
David Pearson, Acting Chief Planning Officer  
Planning Department, PO Box No 96, Waterside House, Sale Waterside,  
Sale, M33 7ZF  
Telephone 0161 912 3198**