

AGENDA ITEM 3

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 12th April 2018

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.
90597	Land Adjacent To Station Cottages, Manchester Road, Altrincham	Broadheath	1		
92767	Great Heys, 74 Bankhall Lane, Hale Barns, WA15 0LW	Hale Barns	22	✓	✓
93334	144 Broad Road, Sale, M33 2DF	Sale Moor	56	✓	
93723	46 Cumberland Road, Urmston, M41 9HR	Urmston	66		
93744	133 Arnesby Avenue, Sale, M33 2WH	Priory	72	✓	

Page 1 90597/OUT/17: Land Adjacent To Station Cottages, Manchester Road, Altrincham.

RECOMMENDATION: MINDED TO GRANT SUBJECT TO LEGAL AGREEMENT

That Members resolve that they would be **MINDED TO GRANT** planning permission for the development and that the determination of the application hereafter be deferred and delegated to the Head of Planning and Development as follows:-

- (i) To complete a suitable Legal Agreement under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure:
 - A financial contribution of £7,720.65 towards enhancing the quality of existing local facilities to compensate for the loss of protected open space at the application site.
- (ii) To carry out minor drafting amendments to any planning condition.
- (iii) To have discretion to determine the application appropriately in the circumstances where a S106 Agreement has not been completed within three months of the resolution to grant planning permission.
- (iv) That upon satisfactory completion of the above Legal Agreement that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions (unless amended by (ii) above):

Conditions as listed on the main report to committee with the following amendment:-

Delete condition 15.

Page 22 92767/FUL/17: Great Heys, 74 Bankhall Lane, Hale Barns, WA15 0LW

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	John Cutler (Agent)
	FOR:	Stephen Hodder (On behalf of Neighbours)

CONSULTATIONS

Trafford Council Local Highway Authority – No objection, subject to conditions/informative (including to request details of the site access, to require the provision of a service management plan, to request a full travel plan, and cycle parking details, and an advisory note to protect the public right of way)

REPRESENTATIONS

A further representation (in objection) has been received since the main officer report was drafted. It is understood that this representation has also been submitted directly to Planning Committee Members and that it may be referred to as part of an objector's presentation.

The representation takes the form of: vehicle tracking diagrams prepared by a highways consultant appointed by objectors; and annotated photographs of Bankhall Lane. The representation is intended to support concerns that the proposal is unacceptable in highways terms. As explained in the main officer report, the Local Highway Authority (LHA) has scrutinised the highways implications of the application, and indeed the LHA has been forwarded a copy of this late representation, although with the issues that it generates having already been considered as part of the original extensive review.

OBSERVATIONS

With reference to the tracking diagrams, which show the movements of a refuse vehicle, the LHA has confirmed it is satisfied that refuse vehicles in use in Trafford could successfully enter and exit the site without detriment to the safe operation of Bankhall Lane. However, that other, larger service vehicles may visit the proposed care home for a variety of reasons (for example, by suppliers) is recognised by the LHA, and with the potential for such deliveries to be problematic if not subject to controls. Accordingly, the LHA - if the application were to be approved - has recommended the imposition of a condition which would have the effect of limiting the size and type of vehicles that could enter the site (in the form of a 'service management plan').

The photographs are intended to highlight particular hazards along this stretch of Bankhall Lane, and with the annotations including references to the 'dangerous blind bend', 'vulnerable road users' and 'the results of a traffic accident'. Whilst these have been shared with the LHA, the LHA has re-emphasised the following: that the proposed new, re-sited access would enable adequate levels of visibility for drivers exiting the site; that the Greater Manchester Police's databases have been examined but there is no record of any traffic accidents which caused personal injury along this part of Bankhall Lane over the requisite five year period; that the footpaths along Bankhall Lane, whilst not of the preferred two metres width, are generally DDA compliant, and in any event a proposal of this nature and in this location is not likely to generate significant pedestrian movement; and that there is no evidence, with reference to police data, of excessive vehicle speeds along Bankhall Lane.

In conclusion, whilst the application carries a recommendation of refusal on three grounds, the LHA considers that there is no basis for adding to this with a highways reason for refusal which could then be successfully defended at appeal. The consultation response of the LHA is restated above.

SPEAKER(S) **AGAINST:** **Mrs Karen Kemp**
(On behalf of Neighbours)

FOR:

Representations

Further representations have been received from the adjoining property No. 142 Broad Road regarding the following

Rights to light under English Law and Loss of light.

Council have not sought professional advice from a right to light consultant.

Overshadowing

The information states that it is a 3 bed house at the moment but it is actually 4.

The owner does not live at the property and never has done so as they live elsewhere.

Why was the house not centred on the plot in the 1st instance in 1997?

Over development.

With 5 bedrooms it is reasonable that at least 4/5 of the occupants will own a car and a lot of the space that would have been available will be removed by the extension.

Fences recently increased in height at cost of neighbour as decking was laid and a loss of privacy resulted.

Expected if any damage to fence or privets would be replaced by the applicant.

Further details about trees.

Observations

1. A right to light is a civil matter and is separate from daylight and sunlight as considered by Local Planning Authorities. The Council would not therefore seek advice from a right to light consultant. The Impact on the amenity of number 142 Broad Road is addressed in paragraph 9 of the Committee report.

2. It is recognised that the proposal represents a significant increase in floor space, however as addressed in the report the development meets the Council's guidelines. The standards which are set out in Supplementary Planning Document 4 – A Guide to Residential Extensions and Alterations are a statement of what the Council considers good practice and identifies types of extensions and their scale that can usually be undertaken whilst protecting the amenity of neighbours and character of the property and location. In this case, as a result of the plot size and the retention of 3.2m- 4.2m to the side of the property it is considered that the proposal will not result in an overdevelopment of the site.

3. The parking standards set down in the Trafford Core strategy and Supplementary Planning Document 3 – A Guide to Parking standards and design are maximum standards and not minimum standards. The standards require that for a dwelling in this area with four or more bedrooms a maximum of 3 parking spaces should be provided. The proposal will allow for the provision of parking for a minimum of 3 cars at the front of the property and it is considered that there is capacity on street without causing an undue loss of amenity or safety to other road users.

4. It is not relevant to the determination of this application whether the applicant resides at the property.
5. The plans indicate that the property is currently a 4 bedroom dwelling as detailed in the Proposal section of the Committee Report. Planning permission H/44700 granted permission for the erection of 6 x 4 bedroomed detached dwelling-houses with integral garages following demolition of the existing bungalow, associated new access and landscaping works.
6. Any damage to property belonging to a neighbouring property is a civil matter and not one in which the Council can get involved.
7. The protection of the existing trees on the site and satisfactory landscaping will be addressed by way of recommended conditions.

Page 72 93744/HHA/18: 133 Arnesby Avenue, Sale, M33 2WH

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Prakash Badgujar
(Applicant)**

FOR:

**RICHARD ROE, ACTING CORPORATE DIRECTOR OF 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**