

## Agenda Item 3

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 13<sup>th</sup> April 2017

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.
<a href="#">88439</a>	Land Known As Carrington Village On Land Off Manchester Road, Carrington	Bucklow	St	1	✓	✓
<a href="#">88779</a>	Land Off Common Lane Including Asphodal Farm, Common Lane, Carrington, M31 4QJ	Bucklow	St	228	✓	✓

Page 1 88439/HYB/16: Land Known as Carrington Village On Land Off Manchester Road, Carrington

SPEAKER(S)      AGAINST:      Peter Tooher  
(Nexus Planning on behalf of Air Products)  
AND  
Annabel Partridge  
(NJL on behalf Peel Developments)

FOR:      David Rolinson  
(Agent)

## CONSULTATIONS

**Carrington Parish Council** – Comment that the proposed development can only be a good thing for the village, although also refer to traffic problems on Manchester Road. Comments summarised as follows: -

- From the outset there have been numerous opinions on these developments, both good and bad. The Parish Council has listened to the opinions of residents and held many meetings with HIMOR and Trafford to resolve the difficulties that have been put forward. Both HIMOR and Trafford have held public consultations and the Parish Council feel that these two developments can only be a good thing for the village.
- There are many pensioners and infirm residents in Carrington and the nearest shop is two miles in either direction. The Carrington Village development would bring these facilities closer and help in the daily life of the village.
- The industrial development will give employment to many local people.
- The negatives of the developments must also be considered. The traffic on Manchester Road, Carrington Lane and Flixton Road during the rush hour is horrendous. At the junction of these roads a yellow box system must be put in place and pedestrian access buttons be put on the Isherwood Road side of the junction as soon as possible.
- Another option to alleviate congestion on Manchester Road would be to open the private road that runs through the development site to commercial traffic only thus leaving Manchester Road for cars.
- These problems need to be addressed before or during the initial progress of these developments and not left as an afterthought.
- Both developments can bring a much needed boost to Carrington and its residents and breathe new life and community spirit into the village.

**LLFA** – Recommend minor amendments to Conditions 26 and 29, as summarised below.

**United Utilities** – Recommend minor amendments to Conditions 26, 27 and 29, as summarised below.

## REPRESENTATIONS

A further representation has been received, advising that residents have met with HIMOR to discuss public rights of way and continued access to Carrington Moss. A meeting was held on 11 April and included local residents, representatives of horse-riding and cycling groups and the Peak and Northern Footpaths Society. The representation (and previous representations from the Peak and Northern Footpaths Society), request that approval will be subject to the following: -

- 1) Access to Carrington Moss for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders is retained via existing tracks and paths (whether formally recognised as footpaths and bridleways or not), including access from Common Lane

(which currently has a locked gate, despite HIMOR agreeing in their planning application 88779/OUT/16 to keep this open), unless alternative footpaths and bridleways are agreed.

- 2) The proposed road widening scheme along Carrington Lane continues to incorporate a verge suitable for horse riders and walkers at one side of the road (as it currently does). We would be happy for this facility to be re-sited onto what is HIMOR land, close to the widened road (but we do not want to lose the facility when the road widening scheme is agreed).

## **OBSERVATIONS**

### HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

#### Local Road Network

Paragraph 10.5 of the report refers to an application for funding for the proposed A1 link road having been made to the Department of Transport. The applicant has clarified that applications for funding have been submitted to the Greater Manchester Growth Deal 3 and to the Highways England Growth Housing Fund, not to the Department of Transport.

The Transport Assessment included sensitivity tests at the request of TfGM to assess the impact of suppressed demand on the local network. As part of this assessment, the impact of an additional 499 vehicles being added to the local network in the AM Peak Period and 305 vehicles in the PM Peak Period was assessed. This additional demand is likely to significantly exceed any background traffic increases that may arise on the network. As such, it is considered that the traffic flows used in the assessment of the impact of the developments on the local network are robust.

The LHA is in receipt of a query (albeit not a formal representation) that states the TAs for the Carrington applications do not take into account the trip generation of the existing lawful uses on the National Grid/Voltage Park site. Based on the information provided by the author of the query, the estimated number of trips likely to be generated by the lawful use of the Voltage Park site would be 114 AM arrivals and 15 departures (total 129) and 15 PM arrivals and 110 departures (total 125). Although the TA has not taken into account traffic at the Voltage Park site (as it is currently unoccupied), it is considered the traffic that it could potentially generate can be accommodated on the road network in addition to both Carrington applications and the committed developments referred to in the report.

As stated above and in the report, the TA has included sensitivity tests to assess the impact of suppressed demand on the local network, which looks at the eastbound approach to the Isherwood Road junction. The volume of suppressed demand in the PM is almost three times the traffic likely to be leaving an operational Voltage Park site, even if it all travelled east. The AM cannot be so directly compared to the direction of travel of the suppressed demand since the representation estimates 114 arrivals, which would more likely to be travelling

westbound. However, the modelling of the suppressed demand results in the lights being green at the Isherwood Road junction for traffic on Manchester Road travelling both east and west for a longer period of time, therefore also benefiting traffic arriving at the Voltage Park site from the east.

It is considered that this would easily accommodate the traffic generated by the lawful use of the Voltage Park site in addition to both Carrington developments.

In response to the comments made by Carrington Parish Council relating to the Manchester Road/Flixton Road/Isherwood Road junction, a full all red to traffic pedestrian cycle on the traffic lights is not considered appropriate as it would not be able to channel vehicles through as effectively. It may be feasible to include a signalled pedestrian crossing on the Isherwood Road arm of the junction when the improvement works to this junction are implemented. This will be explored in conjunction with TfGM during the detailed design stage. With regards to the suggestion that the A1 road could be used for commercial traffic, there is no requirement for further mitigation over and above what is proposed – the development cannot fix existing problems and the A1 road requirement is not triggered. The trigger points for the proposed junction improvements are at either no development (Common Lane) or a low quantum of development (Carrington Village) so would not be an afterthought.

The representation referred to above requests that the proposed road widening scheme along Carrington Lane continues to incorporate a verge suitable for horse riders and walkers at one side of the road (as it currently does). Condition 17 as set out in the report requires a detailed design scheme for the off-site highway works to be submitted and approved and it is considered that this request can be given further consideration at that stage. The applicant has confirmed that they are happy to address this issue through the discharge of Condition 17.

### Strategic Road Network

As set out in the opening paragraphs of the main report, Peel has made a late criticism of the Council's approach to the assessment of highway and infrastructure matters in respect of both Carrington applications. This report addresses whether there is any merit in the points raised and if there is, whether the issue raised could make any difference to officers' conclusions and therefore to the recommendation that planning permission should be granted. Officers have carried out analysis of the data available and have made a judgement as to whether it is necessary to obtain further data and information before reaching a judgment on the issues. For reasons explained below officers do not consider that it is necessary to seek further information or carry out further analysis in the light of Peel's criticism. It is apparent from the analysis carried out on existing data that there is no merit to the concerns raised and there is no reason to take the analysis any further.

The view of officers is clear:

- 1) The modelling assumptions in relation to WGIS are justified, reasonable, internally consistent and correct;
- 2) Even if another possible scenario could have been tested officers are satisfied that there is no need to require further detailed modelling or obtain new data because the high level analysis undertaken demonstrates that there is no reason to consider that there would be likely to be severe impacts from the developments on the SRN in the event of WGIS not being delivered; and
- 3) Peel's assumption that these proposals should be subject to the same requirements as TW ignore the basic fact that the implications of the Carrington developments on the road network are entirely different from TW because of their respective locations and traffic dispersal from the sites.

For clarity, the various phases of TW are henceforth referred to as TW 250, TW 1050 and TW 3000 in this report, with the corresponding development quantum and requirement for WGIS as set out in the table below.

Phase of Development	Development Quantum	WGIS Requirement
TW 250	No more than 250 dwellings, 27,870sqm of B1 office floorspace and 2,000sqm of ancillary commercial floorspace, up to 100 bedroom hotel, carehome.	'No-WGIS'
TW 1050	No more than 1050 dwellings, 27,870sqm of B1 office floorspace and 4,579sqm of ancillary commercial floorspace, up to 100 bedroom hotel, carehome.	'Part-WGIS'
TW 3000	Up to 3000 dwellings, 80,000sqm of B1 office floorspace, 6,700sqm of ancillary commercial floorspace, up to 300 bedroom hotel, carehome.	'Full-WGIS'

### **Highways England Modelling of Carrington developments including WGIS**

The TA submitted with the application includes the approved Western Gateway Infrastructure Scheme (WGIS) in the modelling. As set out in Paragraph 10.39 of the main report, the 2016 opening year assessments, (DM1 and DS1) take into account Part WGIS, Committed Developments, and both Carrington applications. The 2026 future year assessments (DM2 and DS2) assume Full WGIS, Committed Developments and both Carrington applications. DM1 assumes TW 250 and DM2 assumes TW 3000. The full development quantum at both

Carrington Village and Common Lane is included in both opening and future year assessments.

Officers' judgement is that it is correct and appropriate to include Part WGIS at opening year and Full WGIS at future year and for the following reasons:-

- 1) A judgement **has** to be made as to the anticipated road network (i.e. likely traffic volumes and road infrastructure) at opening year and future year. The opening and future year assessments are not modelled on the current network but on a 'future network' i.e. with committed developments and proposed infrastructure in place.
- 2) There has to be internal consistency in the highways modelling. If TW is assumed as a committed development then it is also necessary to assume WGIS comes forward because that is what policy and the resolution in respect of TW requires. Conversely if WGIS is excluded from the modelling, so must more than TW 250 and therefore capacity on the road network would be significantly greater. TW was appropriately included in the modelling as a committed development in order to understand the cumulative impact of development on the SRN in Trafford and this position has not been criticised. The TA for TW 3000 does not include any scenario without Part or Full WGIS in place.
- 3) (i) Part WGIS is under construction and coming forward now and there is every reason to assume it will be completed. It has an expected completion date of late 2017. Additionally, its construction follows the securing of significant public sector funding which it is understood is subject to a contractual requirement for the delivery of the scheme. It is therefore judged to be extremely unlikely that Part WGIS will not be completed before significant development comes forward at Carrington.  
  
(ii) Highway England's Opening Year scenario for Trafford Waters assumes Part WGIS is provided in 2017 and this is in accordance with Peel's intentions as expressed to both Trafford and Salford City Council, even with the collapse of the bridge delaying works.  
  
(iii) WGIS is not being built to provide highway capacity only for the Trafford Waters development. Part WGIS needs to be in place for any more than 26,000sqm of development to come forward at Port Salford (Condition 9 of Salford CC planning permission 14/65747/EIAHYB).  
  
(iv) Part WGIS is required for anything more than TW 250. The TW 3000 TA states that although not necessary for TW 250, in practice Part WGIS will be in place before the construction of TW 250 is completed. The most recent infrastructure phasing plan for TW 3000 provided to officers on 11 April 2017, included Part WGIS being provided after TW 250. A proposal put forward by the developer of TW to Highways England to investigate an alternative phasing of the TW 3000 scheme, with Full WGIS coming forward after TW 1050 rather than TW 250 (reported for information

elsewhere on this agenda), does not seek to alter the trigger for Part WGIS following TW 250. It would therefore not be reasonable to assume an alternative trigger for Part WGIS.

(v) The Core Strategy policy framework for the delivery of development at the Trafford Centre Rectangle, of which Trafford Waters is a substantial part, clearly sets out that WGIS is required for the quantum of development proposed in that plan. WGIS has consistently been put forward by Peel as the proposed mitigation for development in the Trafford Centre Rectangle and in Salford, in the vicinity of and to provide relief to J10 to J11 of the M60, including during the preparation of Trafford's Core Strategy.

4) (i) Whilst the timelines for Full WGIS and TW 3000 are not set, it is judged appropriate to assume Full WGIS by 2032 because firstly, all the evidence suggests that TW 1050 will be exceeded significantly before then and secondly, it is unrealistic to suppose that TW will stop or stall at 1050 when its whole premise is of a much larger sustainable community.

(ii) The development of Carrington Village will be phased, with approximately 150 dwellings proposed at 2020 and the full development quantum by 2028. The full quantum of development at Common Lane should come forward within the plan period (before 2026). It is extremely unlikely that, when Peel bring forward the TW site, they will limit development at that site to no more than 250 dwellings. As such, it is also extremely unlikely that Carrington will come forward on a motorway network which does not include Part WGIS.

(iii) Even if TW and Part WGIS do not transpire, the impact of the Carrington applications on the part of the network where WGIS is intended to provide mitigation would be insignificant. With Part WGIS and / or Full WGIS no significant impact on the SRN is predicted. As demonstrated below, there is no reason to think the position would be different without WGIS in place.

It should also be noted that the RHS Bridgewater proposals, which Salford City Council were minded to grant subject to referral to the Secretary of State (as the proposals are in the Green Belt) on 6 April 2017, was also modelled with Part WGIS in place on the motorway network. The officer report did not identify any requirement for Part WGIS to mitigate the effects of the development on the SRN, and the committed developments identified in the TA did not include either Port Salford or TW. This approach has clearly been considered entirely appropriate for this site by Salford City Council, which is geographically closer to both the M60 and WGIS than the two Carrington applications.

### **Impact of the Carrington applications in a 'No-WGIS' scenario**

It is officers' clear view that the baseline of the highways modelling is appropriate and reasonable. In the light of Peel's objections officers have considered whether

the 'No-WGIS' scenario would invalidate the conclusion that the development would not have a 'severe' impact in NPPF terms on the highway network. This is referred to in the main report at Paragraph 10.67.

An initial assessment of this scenario has been undertaken to provide a broad indication as to whether this gives rise to significant implications. The TA for the TW application does not include any scenario without WGIS in place. To understand the impact of the TW development without WGIS, it is necessary to look at the 2010 Trafford Quays applications (75930/FULL/2010 and 75931/FULL/2010), which together comprise 250 residential units, 27,870sqm of B1 office floorspace and 2,000sqm of ancillary commercial floorspace (effectively equivalent to TW 250, and on the same site as the TW development).

The Trafford Quays TA considered 3 flow groups and all have been used in this analysis alongside the data from the Carrington applications TA. Although the Trafford Quays applications are modelled on 2010 traffic flows, predicted traffic growth has been factored in but does not have a significant effect on the analysis.

This analysis focuses on M60 J10 as it is where the greatest and most significant impact on the SRN from the TW development is felt, and where mitigation is required to alleviate the 'severe' impacts of this development. It is also the closest junction to the Carrington development which WGIS is intended to relieve. It is therefore an appropriate choice for determining whether the Carrington applications require WGIS as mitigation.

### Turning Flows

With regards to M60 Turning Flows at Junction 10 the analysis shows the predicted increase in turning flows at the M60 Junction 10 attributable to the Trafford Quays development and therefore TW 250, is approximately 11% in the morning peak hour 0800-0900 and approximately 7.5% in the afternoon peak hour 1700-1800. The Carrington TA anticipates that there will be negligible turning traffic at M60 J10 attributable to the Carrington developments because there is a more attractive route to the area around J10 either to or from Carrington, using the local road network through Flixton and Davyhulme. If joining the M60 at J8 there would be negligible vehicle movements exiting at J10, and similarly if joining at J10 very few vehicles would exit at J8 for Carrington.

It is evident that the Carrington applications would not have any discernible impact on the operation of J10, whereas TW plainly would.

### Mainline Flows

An analysis of M60 mainline directional and two-way flows either side of Junction 10 has been undertaken for each of the reference flow cases with the introduction of firstly Trafford Quays, secondly Carrington Village and Common Lane, and thirdly the three developments combined.



In summary this indicates that the increase in the M60 two way mainline flows attributable to the Trafford Quays development is approximately 2% in the AM peak hour 0800 to 0900 and is approximately 1.7% in the PM peak hour 1700 to 1800.

The combined Carrington Village and Common Lane development traffic is approximately 1.2% in the AM peak hour 0800 to 0900 and is approximately 0.9% in the PM peak hour 1700 to 1800, just over half the volume of the Trafford Quays development flows.

The combined effect of TW 250 and both Carrington developments traffic is approximately 3.2% in the AM peak hour 0800 to 0900 and is approximately 1.3% in the PM peak hour 1700 to 1800.

Therefore even in respect of through traffic, the contribution of the Carrington applications to congestion at Junctions 10 to 11 is much less than Trafford Waters.

### Conclusion

Without Part WGIS being in place, the cumulative effect of the Carrington applications on the SRN would not be 'severe' in NPPF terms, and indeed is likely to be very small, both with and without Part (or Full) WGIS. Officers do not consider that any re-modelling of the Carrington developments is necessary as the model outputs would not be significantly different without Part WGIS in the baseline assumptions. They would not point to a 'severe' impact. There is no reason to take this point any further.

This broad overview of the data is consistent with officer's view that the location and travel characteristics of TW and the Carrington applications are very different and that the implications on the M60 are not comparable. It is not appropriate or possible to say that because "x" is required in conjunction with TW, it is also required in conjunction with the Carrington applications. The situations are wholly different.

### **Impact of the Carrington applications with Part WGIS and 1050 residential units at Trafford Waters**

In order to establish whether the cumulative impact of TW 1050 and Carrington is 'severe' in NPPF terms, the LHA have used available data to produce a high level review which assesses the impact of TW 1050 with the full development quantum of both Carrington Village and Common Lane applications, in a scenario where Full WGIS (and as a consequence TW 3000) did not come forward.

Highways England have included both Carrington Village and Common Lane applications in their 'uncertainty log' when modelling TW 1050. This is based on opening year (2017) and future year (2032) scenarios, with TW 1050 at opening year and TW 3000 at future year. The opening year scenario includes 360

dwellings at Carrington (on the basis of likely build out rates) and 1560 at future year (the entirety of the Strategic Location allocation which is more than twice that proposed in the Carrington Village planning application). The employment floorspace at Carrington is similarly proportioned out.

The review focused on through traffic and turning traffic at J9 and J10 of the M60 as due to the respective locations of both schemes this is where, if there were to be an impact, the greatest cumulative effect of both schemes would arise.

The resulting variations in traffic flow are small as a result of the cumulative effect of both TW 1050 and Carrington schemes. A 'severe' impact would not arise on the motorway network. It should also be noted that this is a worst case scenario as it effectively 'double counts' the impact of that part of the Carrington development already included in HE's uncertainty log.

It is also noted that Highways England has accepted that both TW 1050 and Carrington schemes do not generate sufficient volumes of vehicular traffic for the impact to be considered "severe" in NPPF terms. Both consultation responses were issued on the same day and refer to the cumulative impact of development.

This analysis demonstrates that the cumulative impact would not be 'severe'. This is because the impacts of each scheme affect the motorway network in a different manner because of their respective geographical locations. The traffic generated by either TW 1050 or the Carrington developments that would route to or through the closest junctions to the other development site would be very limited and therefore any cumulative effect would be marginal.

### **Conclusion on highways matters**

The exercise has demonstrated that the contribution of the Carrington applications to the issues of congestion around J9 – J11 is that, by virtue of the Carrington sites' location relative to this part of the motorway network, of a different order of significance to the impacts from Trafford Waters. Therefore the fact the schemes are being treated differently in respect of mitigation required is entirely valid.

### **PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY**

The representation requests that any permission retains access to Carrington Moss for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders via existing tracks and paths; however the Carrington Village application does not affect these routes, nor propose any alterations to these routes. As such it is not considered reasonable or necessary to attach a condition to any permission requiring that access is retained to Carrington Moss. Common Lane is a Public Right of Way providing access to Carrington Moss and the implications of the Common Lane application are considered in that report.

## AIR QUALITY

For the avoidance of doubt the recommendations of the Council's Pollution and Licensing Section and Public Health England in respect of dust mitigation, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) are addressed by Conditions 36 and 37 of the Recommendation. PHE's recommendation for a CTMP is incorporated into the CEMP condition.

## GROUND CONDITIONS AND CONTAMINATION

Paragraph 12.5 of the report identifies specific mitigation measures relating to potential impacts on human health and controlled waters during construction. It is recommended the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) required by Condition 36 includes a further requirement that any other measures identified in the ES are also included in the CEMP.

## FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE STRATEGY

The LLFA and United Utilities recommend minor amendments to Conditions 25, 26, 27 and 29, summarised below.

## ECOLOGY AND NATURE CONSERVATION

Paragraphs 14.10 and 14.14 of the report identify specific mitigation measures relating to potential impacts on habitats and protected species during construction. It is recommended the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) required by Condition 36 includes a further requirement that these specific measures identified in the ES are also included in the CEMP.

## NOISE AND VIBRATION

Paragraph 20.52 of the report provides an assessment of noise from the proposed employment uses and identifies mitigation measures that can be employed to ensure noise of a commercial or industrial nature is not an issue in the locality. The ES states that mitigation measures can be secured by condition and considered at reserved matters stage. A suitable condition needs to be added to the recommendation and is set out below.

Paragraph 20.58 of the report refers to noise assessments and details of mitigation being required by Condition 35. This condition is now Condition 38.

## RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The representations include the comment "*The plans seem to cross over onto land on School Lane not owned by HIMOR. Land is being unlawfully taken by HIMOR and needs a full investigation*". In response to this statement, the applicant has confirmed they have undertaken a detailed land registry search and confirm that all land within the red edge is owned by HIMOR.

## WASTE MANAGEMENT

In addition to Policy L6 of the Core Strategy, the Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan is relevant to the management of waste. For the avoidance of doubt there are no specific policies within the Waste Plan of direct relevance to this application.

## DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

### Affordable Housing

The applicants' Development Viability Report states that the proposed affordable housing provision would be an "intermediate / starter home product provision", delivered directly by the developer on site at a discount to market value. The 2015 Written Ministerial Statement and Starter Homes exception sites guidance define Starter Homes as being new homes available to first time buyers sold at a minimum discount of 20% below full market value. As set out in the report, the proposed provision of 5% of the residential units within the scheme as Starter Homes is considered an acceptable type and level of affordable housing provision for the application (also subject to ongoing review of scheme viability).

The report also notes that Starter Homes are not currently classified as affordable housing under the terms of the NPPF. Until such time as the Starter Home Regulations are brought into effect, Starter Homes cannot be delivered as part of the affordable housing scheme. There is also the potential scenario that at the time the proposed development is brought forward, Starter Homes would not constitute affordable housing or that the definition of a Starter Home would be different to that above.

The wording of the affordable housing provision to be agreed in the S106 agreement will require the provision of Starter Homes as proposed by the applicant, however it will also cover the scenario that an alternative form of affordable housing may need to be delivered in the event of either of the above. This would need to meet the definition of affordable housing in the NPPF at the time of delivery. This will not affect the total number of affordable units to be provided across the site.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Heads of Terms for the legal agreement as set out in the report omit the requirement for a financial contribution towards improvements to the Common Lane/Manchester Road junction, therefore the following needs to be added to the terms: -

Financial Contribution towards highway improvements to Common Lane/A6144 Manchester Road Junction (figure to be confirmed and agreed)

Amended conditions:-

Condition 25 amended to read 'No less than two months prior to submission...'

Condition 26 amended to also require the following: 1) a detailed surface water drainage **and foul** scheme where drainage within a phase is shown to interconnect with other phases or part phases of the development; 2) to specify that there shall only be 1 foul water pumping station for the entire site; and 3) no surface water, land drainage or highway drainage to connect with the existing public sewerage system.

Condition 27 amended to also include a reference to Condition 26.

Condition 29 requiring a foul drainage scheme amended to also require details of any associated temporary arrangements and also the references to point (iii) of Condition 25 are replaced by references to Condition 26.

Condition 36 requiring a CEMP amended to also include details of any other mitigation measures identified in the ES.

Additional condition:-

Any application(s) for Reserved Matters for Layout or Appearance that include buildings in any of the employment areas identified on drawing number 04036 – Parameters Plan – Land Use, shall include a noise assessment and details of proposed mitigation measures to be provided in those areas. No building or external area within the employment areas shall be brought into use until all approved mitigation relevant to that building and/or use has been implemented in accordance with the approved measures and the approved mitigation shall be maintained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure adequate noise mitigation measures are provided in the interest of residential amenity in accordance with Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Page 228 88779/OUT/16: Land Off Common Lane Including Asphodal Farm, Common Lane, Carrington, M31 4QJ**

<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	<b>Richard Frudd (Agent for National Grid) AND Cllr. Wayne Edwards (Partington Parish Council)</b>
	<b>FOR:</b>	<b>David Rolinson (Agent)</b>

## CONSULTATIONS

**Carrington Parish Council** – Comment that the proposed development can only be a good thing for the village, although also refer to traffic problems on Manchester Road. Comments summarised as follows: -

- From the outset there have been numerous opinions on these developments, both good and bad. The Parish Council has listened to the opinions of residents and held many meetings with HIMOR and Trafford to resolve the difficulties that have been put forward. Both HIMOR and Trafford have held public consultations and the Parish Council feel that these two developments can only be a good thing for the village.
- There are many pensioners and infirm residents in Carrington and the nearest shop is two miles in either direction. The Carrington Village development would bring these facilities closer and help in the daily life of the village.
- The industrial development will give employment to many local people.
- The negatives of the developments must also be considered. The traffic on Manchester Road, Carrington Lane and Flixton Road during the rush hour is horrendous. At the junction of these roads a yellow box system must be put in place and pedestrian access buttons be put on the Isherwood Road side of the junction as soon as possible.
- Another option to alleviate congestion on Manchester Road would be to open the private road that runs through the development site to commercial traffic only thus leaving Manchester Road for cars.
- These problems need to be addressed before or during the initial progress of these developments and not left as an afterthought.
- Both developments can bring a much needed boost to Carrington and its residents and breathe new life and community spirit into the village.

**LLFA** – Recommend that the FRA and Drainage Strategy are amended to include the following: -

- The Greenfield runoff rates have been calculated to 7.6 l/s/ha, this is not in accordance with levels provided in the Councils Level 2 Hybrid SFRA. The maximum permissible discharge runoff rate for a Greenfield site is 5 l/s/ha for a 1 in 100 year event + 30 % Climate Change allowance.
- Demonstrate that the proposed drainage will have the capacity to contain flows for the following design criteria:
  - 1 in 1 year critical storm event – no surcharge
  - 1 in 30 year critical storm event – no flooding
  - 1 in 100 year critical storm event – some flooding to be kept on site, and does not affect any properties or elsewhere.
- Outline design for the proposed SUDs facility. Evidence must be provided that the high G.W.L will not affect the design and cause any flooding to the site.

The LLFA has subsequently recommended replacement and additional conditions to those set out in the report.

## REPRESENTATIONS

A further response from the Peak and Northern Footpaths Society refers to the fact that the landowner has erected a new, gated but locked, palisade fence near to Asphodel Farm that no longer provides any pedestrian access to Carrington Moss from Common Lane. This action appears to go against the intention expressed in paragraph 17.5 of the report that "*there will be access into the site and from there onto the Moss*". The representation states it is a matter of concern that the applicant appears to be making promises to the Council to maintain public access, whilst at the same time acting to remove that access.

A further representation advises that residents have met with HIMOR to discuss public rights of way and continued access to Carrington Moss. A meeting was held on 11 April and included local residents, representatives of horse-riding and cycling groups and the Peak and Northern Footpaths Society. The representation (and previous representations from the Peak and Northern Footpaths Society), request that approval will be subject to the following: -

- 3) Access to Carrington Moss for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders is retained via existing tracks and paths (whether formally recognised as footpaths and bridleways or not), including access from Common Lane (which currently has a locked gate, despite HIMOR agreeing in their planning application 88779/OUT/16 to keep this open), unless alternative footpaths and bridleways are agreed.
- 4) The proposed road widening scheme along Carrington Lane continues to incorporate a verge suitable for horse riders and walkers at one side of the road (as it currently does). We would be happy for this facility to be re-sited onto what is HIMOR land, close to the widened road (but we do not want to lose the facility when the road widening scheme is agreed).

## OBSERVATIONS

### HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

Further information relating to the impact of both Carrington developments on the Local and Strategic Road Network is set out in the Additional Information Report for the Carrington Village application. Members are referred to that report.

### FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE

The applicant has confirmed the following in response to the issues raised by the LLFA: -

- The Greenfield Runoff rate has been calculated in accordance with Interim Code of Practice for SUDs (IPC) using IH124 methods as stated in the FRA & Drainage Strategy. This is the industry standard procedure and has been applied on numerous sites across Greater Manchester in the past.

- The drainage design proposed includes swales and it is not possible to surcharge a swale.
- The swales will be designed to provide conveyance without flooding during a 1 in 30 year return period rainfall event. P17 of the FRA & Drainage Strategy calculates volumes of the SUDs attenuation pond required, and demonstrates there is sufficient land space to accommodate this and store the required volume, and hence prevent flooding. If more detail is required, it is anticipated TMBC may request detailed design proposals to be submitted as a planning condition (at the appropriate time when proposals are fixed).
- The drainage systems and site levels will be designed such that buildings do not flood during a 1 in 100 year return period plus 40% climate change rainfall event in accordance with NPPF requirements. P17 of the FRA & Drainage Strategy calculates volumes of the exceedance storage required and demonstrates there is sufficient land space to accommodate this in car park and internal road areas (Main site) and the road area (Common Lane). If more detail is required, it is anticipated TMBC may request detailed design proposals to be submitted as a planning condition (at the appropriate time when proposals are fixed).
- Groundwater levels were monitored as part of site investigation between April and Nov 2015. A high groundwater table was encountered with water levels ranging between 1 and 2m below ground level (bgl). Consequently, as stated in the FRA & Drainage Strategy the attenuation pond was set at 600mm, above the high groundwater level (1mbgl), to allow a spare freeboard of 400mm.

The LLFA has advised that in line with the Manchester City, Salford City and Trafford Councils Level 2 Hybrid SFRA, a Greenfield run off rate is determined at 5 l/s/ha and a condition specifying this is recommended. Replacement and additional conditions are also recommended requiring details of the following to be submitted and approved: detailed drainage design and surface water drainage scheme to meet the requirements of the SFRA; Sustainable Drainage Scheme to meet the requirements of the SFRA; and a foul drainage scheme. Conditions 16 and 17 in the report are replaced by these conditions.

## PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY

The fact that public access from Common Lane to Carrington Moss is currently prevented is acknowledged at paragraph 1.3 of the report. This does not alter the fact that the applicant's future intention is to allow public access from Common Lane onto the site and from there onto Carrington Moss. The applicant has advised that the existing site has been secured primarily to protect the interests of the existing agricultural tenant on the site. The applicant has reaffirmed that once the site has been developed, there would no longer be this need to secure the site and public access will not be restricted onto the site and beyond.

The representation requests that any permission retains access to Carrington Moss for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders via existing tracks and paths.



Access to Carrington Moss from Common Lane and from the tracks and paths within the site is considered in the report (paragraphs 17.3 to 17.6). The application does not affect any other routes that currently provide access to Carrington Moss, nor propose any alterations to these routes. As such it is not considered reasonable or necessary to attach a condition to any permission requiring that access is retained to Carrington Moss.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Replace Conditions 16 and 17 in the report and add two further conditions with regards drainage:-

1. Notwithstanding the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy 'Himor (Carrington) Limited Land off Common Lane, Carrington Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy' Issue 2, dated 20th June 2016, no development works shall take place unless and until a full detailed drainage design and surface water drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include all relevant documents 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); details of flood exceedance routes for critical rainfall events up to and including a 1 in 100 year storm event including Climate Change allowance to indicate any potential risks and effects on any adjacent sites and to ensure that a fully formed comprehensive detailed drainage strategy is in place; timescales for implementation; and details of how the scheme will be maintained and managed after completion. The approved schemes shall thereafter be implemented, maintained and managed in accordance with the approved details and timescales.

Reason: To prevent and mitigate flooding in accordance with Core Strategy Policies L5, L7, SL5, the NPPF and NPPG. It is necessary for this information to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement given the need to install surface water drainage infrastructure at the start of the construction works.

2. Any application for reserved matters which includes layout shall be accompanied by full details to demonstrate that the discharge runoff rate for the greenfield areas of the site will not exceed 5 l/s/ha. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any building in that phase and shall be retained and maintained thereafter.

Reason: To meet the requirements of the Council's Level 2 Hybrid Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). It is necessary for this information to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement given the need to install surface water drainage infrastructure at the start of the construction works and to prevent flooding in accordance with Core Strategy Policies L5, L7, SL5, the NPPF and NPPG.

3. Notwithstanding the submitted 'Himor (Carrington) Limited Land off Common Lane, Carrington Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Issue

2 20 June 2016', any application for reserved matters for layout (and landscaping where relevant) shall include full details of a Sustainable Drainage Scheme which shall include a maintenance and management plan for the overall catchment area. It will be necessary to constrain the peak discharge rate of storm water from this development (including hard areas) in accordance with the limits indicated in the Guidance Document to the Council's Level 2 Hybrid Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and the NPPF. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full prior to any of the buildings being occupied within that phase. Thereafter the scheme shall be maintained and managed in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To manage flooding and pollution and to ensure that a managing body is in place for the sustainable drainage system and there is a funding and maintenance mechanism for the lifetime of the development, having regard to Core Strategy Policies L5, L7, SL5, the NPPF and NPPG.

4. Notwithstanding the submitted 'Himor (Carrington) Limited Land off Common Lane, Carrington Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Issue 2 20 June 2016', any application for reserved matters which includes layout shall be accompanied by full details of the foul drainage scheme to serve the development including full details of any connections to the foul sewer network and any necessary infrastructure. Foul and surface water shall drain on separate systems and the foul water system shall minimise the need for pumping. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full prior to any of the buildings being occupied within that phase.

Reason: To promote sustainable development, and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution, having regard to Core Strategy Policies L5, L7, SL5, the NPPF and NPPG. It is necessary for this information to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement given the need to install foul water drainage infrastructure at the start of the construction works.

**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**