

AGENDA ITEM 3

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 12th July 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 Chair.

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.
93143	Former Rileys Snooker Club, 1D Bridgewater Road, Altrincham, WA14 1LB	Altrincham	1	✓	✓
93153	Land on Wharf Road, Altrincham, WA14 1ND	Altrincham	36	✓	✓
94320	Oak House, Barrington Road, Altrincham, WA14 1HZ	Altrincham	73	✓	✓

PART 1

Page 1 93143/FUL/17: Former Rileys Snooker Club, 1D Bridgewater Road, Altrincham

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Peter Brumby
(Neighbour)

FOR: Tom Flanagan
(Agent)

Application for the demolition of the existing snooker hall (Class D2) and erection of a 3 to 7 storey residential development consisting of 42 residential units (Class C3) with ancillary amenity space, car parking, cycle parking, bin store, landscaping, new boundary treatment and alterations to the access fronting Bridgewater Road and other associated works.

REPRESENTATIONS

Two further representations have been received since the Committee Report was published. One of these refers to academic articles regarding climate change and flooding matters associated with development. The relevance of these is not clear and they do not constitute planning policy or guidance. As such, these have been afforded little weight in the consideration of the application.

The second representation raises the following concerns in respect of this application:

- Supporting highways document not uploaded when received
- The stated parking requirement is incorrect and stackers will now be used
- Disagreement with Curtins' (applicant's highway consultant) statement and comparison with 'The Bridge' apartments
- Residents have conducted their own parking survey at 'The Bridge'

OBSERVATIONS

1. Whilst all representations made prior to the Committee Report being published have been considered, Officers consider there are certain issues which should be addressed further, together with the additional issues raised above.

DESIGN AND APPEARANCE

2. The scheme is not considered to be of an unacceptably high density. The site is within a sustainable location where a greater density of development is generally encouraged. For the reasons set out in the Committee Report, the scheme is considered to have been appropriately designed and the density proposed does not result in unacceptable harm on any material planning grounds.
3. It is considered that an additional condition requiring the submission of a maintenance scheme for the proposed landscaping works should be attached to any consent issued, in order to ensure this is appropriately maintained. This is listed below.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

4. The proposed development is not considered to result in an undue impact on surrounding properties through noise once operational, given that this

is a residential use within a largely residential area and therefore wholly appropriate. Whilst some additional vehicular movements will be generated, the highway section in the Committee Report explains that this impact will be limited and there is not considered to be an unacceptably greater impact from noise resulting from the development.

5. It is considered that an additional condition ensuring the third floor flat roof is not used as amenity space by residents should be attached to any consent issued. This is in the interests of ensuring there is no unacceptable overlooking impact on surrounding properties from this location. This condition is listed below.

HIGHWAY MATTERS

6. Having regard to the comments raised regarding the use of car 'stackers', it is noted that these are not proposed as part of the development. The scheme has evolved through discussions between the Local Planning Authority and the applicant, at one point during which stackers were put forward as an option. These were not however considered to be appropriate in this location and as such, these do not form part of the current proposals. In terms of the SPD3 parking requirement for the development, this is clearly set out within the Committee Report and is correct. As stated above, the scheme has evolved with changing parking requirements and provision as it has done so, however Officers are satisfied that the development now proposed has been appropriately assessed and is deemed to be acceptable in this respect.
7. The LPA is not obliged to make available on the Council's website every document received in support of or in objection to a planning application. The nature of a complex planning application is such that the scheme evolves as the application progresses and it would not be reasonable or practical for residents to be consulted at every stage of this iterative process.
8. A number of points have been raised which question the approach to, and conclusions reached in Curtins' supporting statement. Many of these are matters of planning judgement which the Committee Report has appropriately addressed as necessary. Residents have carried out their own survey of the car park serving 'The Bridge' apartments, which concludes that the average parking occupancy rate across the four days surveyed was approximately 67 per cent in the peak evening period. It is noted that the maximum occupancy rate recorded in Curtins' survey was 83 per cent.
9. A key concern regarding the survey of 'The Bridge' carried out by Curtins is that this is an affordable housing scheme and does not therefore provide an appropriate comparison. A development comprising a greater proportion of affordable units does not necessarily indicate a significantly lower parking demand and it is noted that the Council's parking standards

do not distinguish between affordable and market housing. The parking survey of 'The Bridge' represents one element of supporting highways information which, together with other evidence included within the applicant's Transport Statement (as set out in the Committee Report), serves to provide adequate justification for the acceptability of the development in this respect.

10. A number of objections refer to the insufficient width of roads in the surrounding area, and the associated difficulty for access by emergency vehicles and conflicts with commercial traffic. A proposed development cannot reasonably be expected to remedy existing issues which may exist through the planning process and the application scheme is not deemed to worsen the current situation in these respects to an extent that would warrant a refusal of planning permission. Notwithstanding this, as noted in the Committee Report, a condition requiring the provision of 'give way' markings at the junction of Wharf and Bridgewater Road will serve to improve the existing situation with regard to vehicles using this junction.
11. It is considered that the matters raised in the further responses have been appropriately addressed either in the main Committee Report or in this Additional Information Report and do not indicate that an alternative recommendation should be made.
12. Since the publication of the Committee Report, the applicant has agreed to the imposition of a condition requiring the submission of a scheme for electric vehicle charging points and this is listed below.

CONDITIONS

It is recommended that the following conditions are attached to any consent issued, in addition to those listed in the Committee Report:

1. The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless and until a scheme for the installation of electric vehicle charging points has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the location and appearance of the charging points. The scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of promoting sustainable travel having regard to Policies L4 and L5 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless and until a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of 5 years has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule.

Reason: To ensure that the site is satisfactorily landscaped having regard to its location, the nature of the proposed development and having regard to Policies L7, R2 and R3 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The 'green roof' shown on the proposed third floor plan shall be accessible for maintenance purposes only and shall at no time be available for use by residents as amenity space or for any other purpose.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity, having regard to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Page 36 93153/FUL/17: Land on Wharf Road, Altrincham

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	Malcolm Coombs (Neighbour)
	FOR:	Rob Haslam (Agent)

REPRESENTATIONS

A further representation has been received which refers to academic articles regarding climate change and flooding matters associated with development. The relevance of these is not clear and they do not constitute planning policy or guidance. As such, these have been afforded little weight in the consideration of the application. It is considered that these matters have been appropriately addressed in the main Committee Report and the recommendation therefore remains unchanged.

OBSERVATIONS

1. Whilst all representations made prior to the Committee Report being published have been considered, Officers consider there are certain issues which should be addressed further.

DESIGN AND APPEARANCE

2. The scheme is not considered to be of an unacceptably high density. The site is within a sustainable location where a greater density of development is generally encouraged. For the reasons set out in the Committee Report, the scheme is considered to have been appropriately designed and the density proposed does not result in unacceptable harm on any material planning grounds.

application process and photographs of the sycamore tree. The writer has also advised that he will be exercising his right to speak at Committee.

OBSERVATIONS

Ecology and Trees

The consent to fell application ref. 94707/TCA/18 relating to a Sycamore Tree on the site was issued on 10th July 2018. The circumstances around the consent to fell application are set out at paragraphs 51 – 53 of the main report.

As set out in the main Committee report there is no requirement to consult residents on consent to fell applications however given the current planning application, the historical tree consent application and interest in relation to the sycamore tree, the immediate neighbours were contacted and made aware of the most recent consent to fell application and the comments received were fully considered prior to determination of that application.

Other Matters

With regard to the e-mail sent on 10th July 2018 by the occupier of No. 1 Barrington Close this contained a solicitors letter setting out private rights of access and making reference to the processing of the consent to fell application. The issue of private rights are not a material planning consideration and the highways aspects of the scheme have been considered by the LHA and their comments set out in the main Committee report.

Para 1.8.2. of SPD4 states *'If planning permission is granted, this does not bestow a right to build. It is the responsibility of the applicant to obtain any other necessary permission to carry out development, for example covenants, byelaws or other legislative requirements such as safeguarding protected species.'*

The processing of the consent to fell application has been described elsewhere in this Additional Information Report and the main Committee Report.

The submitted SPD extracts are noted however the design and tree issues referenced in both SPDs are considered to have been addressed under the relevant 'Ecology and Trees' section of the main report in relation to this site.

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