

## PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT CONTROL) COMMITTEE – 25<sup>th</sup> July 2013

### 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.

#### 2.0 APPLICATIONS FOR PERMISSION TO DEVELOP, ETC. (SPEAKERS)

Part 1 Applications for Planning Permission					
Application	Site Address/Location of Development	Ward	Page	Speakers	
				Against	For
79984	Lyon Industrial Estate, Atlantic Street, Broadheath, Altrincham. WA14 5FY	Broadheath			
80577	B & Q Plc, Atlantic Street, Broadheath, Altrincham. WA14 5BW	Broadheath			

79984/FULL/2013: Lyon Industrial Estate, Atlantic Street, Broadheath.

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Mark Rebbeck  
(Marloneview/MAR)**

**FOR: John Clarke  
(Applicant)**

#### APPLICANTS SUBMISSION

PAG has repeated its offer to work with Maloneview/MAR as they do believe there is sufficient opportunity for a store in both locations and do not see how the proposed scheme would affect that in Sale. (NB this was reported verbally at the meeting on 11 July)

There has been further discussion with Arriva over the 247 bus route extension option and the alternative 'Broadheath Hopper' service; in relation to the Hopper this has been costed over 5 years and the route revised to avoid linking with Altrincham Town Centre and now only connecting as far south as the Navigation Road Tram Stop.

The Broadheath industrial estate and the PAG application site can be made far more accessible with one option or the other funded out of the public transport element of the Trafford Developer Contribution. Further feasibility work is required but it is estimated that the a 5 year bus hopper service with 6 new stops, 2 vehicles and drivers costs would be £549, 000 which would be covered by the Trafford Developer Contribution public transport element.

PAG have submitted a letter dated 24 July sent to committee members which supports their scheme and further questions MAR's ability to deliver a scheme in Sale, with particular reference to a MAR scheme in Winsford.

## **CONSULTATIONS**

No further consultation responses received.

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

### **In Support**

**ASDA** – Have stated as follows:- Whilst we are progressing a deal with PAG at their site in Broadheath, we will still have an active requirement for Sale Square, which will not fall away if the development at Broadheath were approved. Negotiations are still ongoing with MAR Properties on their site in Sale, albeit slowly, and this will continue in addition to any negotiations we are having with PAG at Broadheath.

**Nikal** – Has considered the application by PAG and do not believe it affects Altair an in general the application is supported and welcomed (NB this was reported verbally at the meeting on 11 July).

5 additional letters of support from local businesses expressing similar points as set out in the main report.

### **Comments passed to Altrincham Ward Councillors by residents and a business of Altrincham:**

- There would be a wide range of goods and a large variety of prices.
- It would provide a local, value for money store.
- The proposed bus route would be useful to help access into Altrincham from Broadheath
- A substantially higher S106 payment is associated with this application.

### **Against**

**Cllr Rigby** – Objects to both applications:-

- Supports the officers recommendations to refuse the applications as the effects on Sale town centre would be devastating
- Concern that Sale town centre would be further damaged by additional out of town developments and the town centre has already been affected by several such developments
- Would ask Members to consider that there is an opportunity for Sale town centre to receive fresh investment which would be welcomed by the residents of Sale

- Should Sale town centre be further blighted it could lead to it becoming a shanty town as shops and businesses would close and commerce and business would move out of the area
- Such new investment in Sale would be unlikely should the applications be approved
- In recent years a great deal of infrastructure has been put in place to ensure Sale town centre has been supported and to ensure the town centre remains popular and viable
- It has been recognised nationally that existing town centres must receive the support of planners and planning committees

**Altrincham and Bowdon Civic Society** – objects and raises the following points further to the committee reports:-

- The borderline 'significant adverse impact' on Altrincham town centre should not rest on the, quote,'unquantifiable' benefits of the emerging Altair scheme
- The impact figures (Asda minus 7.8% and Morrisons minus 5.6%) are on the threshold of 'significant adverse impact' and both assume the emerging Altair is built by 2017
- The higher loss of trade figures should Altair not be built by 2017 should be provided, as these will make the impact even more significantly adverse, being a reason for the refusal of both applications
- The higher impact figures (Asda minus 8.9%, Morrisons minus 6.4%, total minus 12.3%) derived from using the Morrisons' retail consultants figures should be used if they are concluded to be more reliable
- We hope that this issue is fully discussed at committee as the vulnerable state of Altrincham town centre should be a key factor in the decision making process.

**Bowdon Downs Residents Association** – Has objected to the Morrisons proposal and objects to the PAG proposal for the following reasons:-

- The scheme will further undermine the vitality and viability of Altrincham town centre, already badly affected by out-of-town retail developments such as the Broadheath Retail Park
- even if the 'emerging' Altair scheme is actually built, the impact figure of minus 7.8%/8.9% is still too high. If it is not built or it is delayed, that figure will be even higher in negatively affecting a very vulnerable town.
- the zoned industrial area of Broadheath has already been eroded through change of use to large retail units selling small, non-bulky goods and parking areas. This large scheme will compromise its primary use even further and risk jobs being lost as firms move away.
- there is no realistic choice of means of public transport due to the remote location, so car use will be maximised
- congestion on the A56 and around is already very bad and this will only make it worse, with a new turning-in lane unlikely to counter the increase in traffic the supermarket and petrol station will bring
- there is no need for another supermarket as there is plenty of choice already in several locations in the area

**Altrincham Town Centre Partnership – objects to the proposals:-**

- a majority of residents would like an ASDA or Morrisons in the area but this doesn't mean they want it in Broadheath, they would rather it was in one of the two town centres
- does Committee support our town centres in accordance with Government guidance or not?
- There are alternative sites in Sale and in Altrincham
- The employment figures do not take account of the National Retail Planning Forum Report 1998 which shows that over time each new out of town superstore results on average in a net loss of 276 jobs within a 15km radius
- If such a superstore were located in a town centre it would attract more shoppers into the town and boost trade and employment
- Job creation is another reason why Committee should refuse both applications
- Nothing is offered in mitigation to the damage caused to Sale
- The PAG mitigation does not offer anything new as these public realm works were already being proposed by the Council so they cannot be seen as mitigation for the PAG proposal, the Council planned to spend this sum of money anyway and it would be wrong to present it as being a benefit of the PAG proposal
- There are no new proposals aimed at addressing the damage that would be caused by the proposals

**Comments passed to Altrincham Ward Councillors by residents and a business of Altrincham:**

- The biggest loser if either development is approved will be Altrincham and Sale town centres. In addition, the road traffic chaos on the A56 will cause even more misery for travellers.
- Little mention was made about the effect on Altrincham town centre. Both applications are contrary to various Government guidelines relating to town centres in addition to transport problems.

**OBSERVATIONS**

It should be noted that the emerging proposals for Altair in Altrincham have now progressed to a valid planning application received on 23 July 2013 (ref: 81115/O/2013). The development proposed reflects the emerging proposals considered in the main committee report.

**80577/FULL/2013: B & Q Plc, Atlantic Street, Broadheath.**

<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	<b>Frank Young (Waitrose)</b>
	<b>FOR:</b>	<b>Richard Bakes (Applicant)</b>

**APPLICANTS SUBMISSION**

The applicants have submitted further supporting information summarised as follows:-

- the Market Street element of Morrisons is simply their marketing description of the fresh food and grocery/fruit offer of the Morrisons store; in practical terms this type of offer is provided within all main foodstores, albeit not described in that particular way. There is no evidence to suggest that the Morrisons proposal would have a greater impact on the market in the town centre than the PAG scheme of any other large foodstore
- based on the July 2013 Holliss Vincent Final Addendum a need for the Morrisons application can be demonstrated, the same cannot be said for the PAG application
- we do not agree that The Square is a sequentially preferable opportunity that is suitable or available for the proposed development; the correspondence from Tesco casts significant doubt on the availability of the site
- the Morrisons site is an established shopping destination that is in an accessible location according to the Committee report. In a scenario where there are no other sequentially preferable sites, para 24 of the NPPF indicates that it is the most appropriate location in which to meet the need that the proposal aims to fulfil
- Morrisons has confirmed that implementation of the proposed development would not change its aspirations for representation in the Sale area. It is not agreed that the planned investment at The Square would be jeopardised by the Morrisons application
- In any event the 2007 GVA Retail And Leisure Study confirms that there is no overriding requirement or need for any additional convenience retail provision in Sale town centre
- The Morrisons committee report confirms that the council is of the view that the PAG scheme would give rise to greater impacts on defined centres than the Morrisons proposal
- The most appropriate recommendation would be for Committee to resolve to approve the principle of the Morrisons application and delegate to officers to discuss design and parking issues further
- There would be no sound planning basis for a decision that favoured the PAG scheme over the Morrisons application.

## **CONSULTATIONS**

**GMAAS** – In summary, any surviving archaeological remains – be they from the Roman period or the nineteenth century – will be of regional or local rather than national significance. On this basis the GMAAS accepts that any archaeological mitigation could be dealt with through a condition placed upon the consent.

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

### **In Support**

2 additional letters received expressing similar points as set out in the main report

### **Against**

**Cllr Rigby** – Objects to both applications:-

- Supports the officers recommendations to refuse the applications as the effects on Sale town centre would be devastating

- Concern that Sale town centre would be further damaged by additional out of town developments and the town centre has already been affected by several such developments
- Would ask Members to consider that there is an opportunity for Sale town centre to receive fresh investment which would be welcomed by the residents of Sale
- Should Sale town centre be further blighted it could lead to it becoming a shanty town as shops and businesses would close and commerce and business would move out of the area
- Such new investment in Sale would be unlikely should the applications be approved
- In recent years a great deal of infrastructure has been put in place to ensure Sale town centre has been supported and to ensure the town centre remains popular and viable
- It has been recognised nationally that existing town centres must receive the support of planners and planning committees

**Altrincham and Bowdon Civic Society** – objects and raises the following points further to the committee reports:-

- The borderline 'significant adverse impact' on Altrincham town centre should not rest on the, quote,'unquantifiable' benefits of the emerging Altair scheme
- The impact figures (Asda minus 7.8% and Morrisons minus 5.6%) are on the threshold of 'significant adverse impact' and both assume the emerging Altair is built by 2017
- The higher loss of trade figures should Altair not be built by 2017 should be provided, as these will make the impact even more significantly adverse, being a reason for the refusal of both applications
- The higher impact figures (Asda minus 8.9%, Morrisons minus 6.4%, total minus 12.3%) derived from using the Morrisons' retail consultants figures should be used if they are concluded to be more reliable
- 

We hope that this issue is fully discussed at committee as the vulnerable state of Altrincham town centre should be a key factor in the decision making process.

**Altrincham Town Centre Partnership** – objects to the proposals:-

- a majority of residents would like an ASDA or Morrisons in the area but this doesn't mean they want it in Broadheath, they would rather it was in one of the two town centres
- does Committee support our town centres in accordance with Government guidance or not?
- There are alternative sites in Sale and in Altrincham
- The employment figures do not take account of the National Retail Planning Forum Report 1998 which shows that over time each new out of town superstore results on average in a net loss of 276 jobs within a 15km radius
- If such a superstore were located in a town centre it would attract more shoppers into the town and boost trade and employment
- Job creation is another reason why Committee should refuse both applications
- Nothing is offered in mitigation to the damage caused to Sale
- The PAG mitigation does not offer anything new as these public realm works were already being proposed by the Council so they cannot be seen as mitigation

- for the PAG proposal, the Council planned to spend this sum of money anyway and it would be wrong to present it as being a benefit of the PAG proposal
- There are no new proposals aimed at addressing the damage that would be caused by the proposals

**Comments passed to Altrincham Ward Councillors by residents and a business of Altrincham:**

- The scheme should have included proposals for improvements of the Manchester Road junction
- The biggest loser if either development is approved will be Altrincham and Sale town centres. In addition, the road traffic chaos on the A56 will cause even more misery for travellers
- Little mention was made about the effect on Altrincham town centre. Both applications are contrary to various Government guidelines relating to town centres in addition to transport problems.

**OBSERVATIONS**

It should be noted that the emerging proposals for Altair in Altrincham have now progressed to a valid planning application received on 23 July 2013 (ref: 81115/O/2013). The development proposed reflects the emerging proposals considered in the main committee report.

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

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