

## AGENDA ITEM 3

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 9<sup>th</sup> August 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.
<a href="#">93987</a>	Library, 405 Stockport Road, Timperley, WA15 7XR	Village	1		✓
<a href="#">93998</a>	Bowdon Lawn Tennis Club Elcho Road, Bowdon, WA14 2TH	Bowdon	29		
<a href="#">94257</a>	211 Dane Road, Sale M33 2NA	Priory	47	✓	
<a href="#">94319</a>	199 Ashley Road, Hale, Altrincham, WA15 9SQ	Hale Central	56	✓	✓
<a href="#">94416</a>	11 Haydock Drive, Timperley WA15 7NH	Hale Barns	76	✓	
<a href="#">94747</a>	Former Kelloggs Building Talbot Road, Stretford, M16 0PU	Longford	83	✓	✓

## **PART 1**

**Page 1 93987/FUL/18: Library, 405 Stockport Road, Timperley**

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:**

**FOR: Paul Westhead  
(Applicant)**

### **CONSULTATIONS**

**Local Highway Authority:** No objection subject to conditions requiring a Construction Management Plan and implementation of the car park/servicing facilities.

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

Three further representations have been received since the Committee Report was published, along with surveys of usage of the car park by employees of surrounding businesses. These are dated from October 2016 and appear to have been completed in relation to the earlier planning application at the site. In addition, what appears to be a poster and flyers relating to parking at the library site have been sent anonymously to the Council. This submission does not raise any further issues and, given that no covering letter has been provided, Officers are not clear as to its purpose.

The additional representations raise the following concerns in respect of this application:

- Japanese knotweed has been identified on the site
- Aimson Road West can be viewed from the proposed apartments within library building
- Car parking is inadequate and will lead to overspill parking on adjacent residential roads. There is already a lack of parking in the village
- Junction of Stockport Road and Baker Street is dangerous to exit
- Any charge for use of car park would be detrimental to Timperley businesses and residents
- Existing roads through village are not wide enough and there is no facility for them to be widened
- Amey parking survey is inadequate
- The application should be removed from the Committee agenda due to the existing permission not being a lawful fall-back position and the report not dealing with the public sector equality duty
- Proposals do not comply with SPD3 car parking standards
- Further modern accommodation on the car park is inappropriate at this time
- The existing library is one of the most modern and best utilised within the Borough

- There is already a modern purpose built welfare facility in the village centre
- There are at least two existing pharmacies in the village
- According to the Council's land sales programme, the car park was sold to the Developer for £175,000 and, it is believed, was not put to open market tender

Issues not already covered within the Committee Report are addressed below.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

1. An additional representation claims that extant permission for the redevelopment of the site may not constitute a legitimate fall-back position to be afforded weight, due to the applicant's Design and Access Statement noting that the four additional apartments are included to 'secure viability' of the scheme. Reference is made in this representation to a High Court case (*R v SoSE ex p Ahern* [1998] Env LR 189), in which tests were laid out to establish whether a fall-back position was relevant in the consideration of a planning application. Having considered the case referred to as a whole and reviewing other relevant case law, and understanding the agreement entered into with regard to the Council's disposal of the land, Officers are satisfied that there is a 'likelihood' or 'real prospect' that the extant permission would be implemented if consent for the current proposal is refused. This goes beyond a 'legal or theoretical' possibility of a fall-back position referred to in the above case. As such, the extant planning permission for the site is considered to constitute a legitimate fall-back position which should be afforded significant weight (as it has been in the Committee Report), in the decision-making process.
2. Notwithstanding the above, it is also noted that planning permission runs with the land to which it relates and the previously approved development could be implemented by an alternative developer. Furthermore, the viability of a particular scheme may change over time and given that over a year remains for the lawful commencement of the earlier consent, this is not considered to affect the status of this existing permission as a realistic fall-back position.
3. In addition to the above, Officers consider that it would not be reasonable for the Council to refuse the application in respect of matters which were deemed to be acceptable under the previously approved application, given that it is considered that, whilst acknowledging that the revised NPPF has been published, there have been no significant material changes in planning policy or guidance in the intervening period which are relevant to this proposal or would cause Officers to come to a different view. All differences between the approved and proposed schemes have been considered fully within the Committee Report.

## RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

4. One of the additional representations raises concerns that properties on Aimson Road West would be overlooked by the proposed apartments within the library building. As stated in the Committee Report, proposed windows will not be any closer to neighbouring properties and boundaries than the approved development. Whilst the four apartments within the library building were not included with the earlier scheme, no windows serving these units will face towards Aimson Road West. As such, the conclusions reached in the Committee Report remain unchanged in respect of matters of residential amenity.

## HIGHWAY MATTERS

5. The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has provided comments on the application since the Committee Report was published. These note that access, servicing and refuse arrangements remain as approved under the earlier application and raise no objection in these respects. Concerns as to the accessibility of the bin stores have been raised, however these are in the same location as approved and following discussions with the agent, the relocation of these elsewhere within the site is not a possibility, as noted in the Committee Report.
6. Whilst the split of car parking differs from the original application, the total number of spaces remains as previously approved and no objections are raised in this respect. Similarly cycle parking provision is also in line with the earlier consent.
7. Overall, the LHA raises no objections to the application subject to conditions requiring the submission of a Construction Management Plan and requiring the provision of car parking and servicing facilities prior to the development being brought into use. Appropriate conditions to this effect are already included within the Committee Report recommendation and as such, it is considered that no further conditions are required.
8. An additional representation refers to an Amey parking survey which is considered to be inadequate. Officers are not clear what survey this is referring to, with the applicant's Transport Statement being provided by Civic Engineers and Amey providing comments on the application in their capacity as the Local Highway Authority. Representations also refer to the possibility of overspill parking on surrounding streets, the insufficient width of roads within Timperley village, the impact on employees of surrounding businesses who have use of the existing car park and the safety of the junction of Stockport Road and Baker Street.
9. As set out in the Committee Report, the current application has to be assessed in the context of the approval for a very similar scheme which exists for the site. Officers do not consider that it would be reasonable to

refuse the application in respect of areas where it does not differ from this extant consent. Highway issues were fully considered under the earlier application and the current application, so far as differences with the approved scheme have arisen. It is considered that the comments made by the LHA and within the additional representations have been appropriately addressed within the Committee Report and this Additional Information Report and do not indicate that an alternative recommendation should be made. The application therefore remains acceptable with regard to highway matters.

## TREES, LANDSCAPING AND ECOLOGY

10. An additional representation refers to Japanese knotweed, an invasive species, being present on site. Officers have no evidence from the applicant or from the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit to indicate that this is the case, however a precautionary condition is recommended to ensure that any Japanese knotweed which may exist on site is appropriately dealt with.

## OTHER MATTERS

11. A representation states that the report does not mention or deal with the public sector equality duty in section 149(1) of the Equality Act 2010 and that a reduction in the number of public parking spaces has the potential to affect persons with disabilities. Officers are satisfied that the resulting level of parking provision is acceptable and in respect of the above duty, are satisfied that persons with disabilities would not be prejudiced in this respect, particularly given that the number of publicly available disability spaces would not decrease from the existing provision. The impact of the development on other protected groups has also been considered and it is concluded that it would either have a neutral or positive impact, would not lead to discrimination and would maintain equality of opportunity.
12. The LPA is required to consider the scheme before it and the suitability of the existing facility is not a matter for which permission could reasonably be refused. Similarly the existence of similar facilities to those proposed (such as pharmacies) within the area does not render the proposed development unacceptable in planning terms.
13. Issues raised in a representation relating to the sale of the land by the Council do not constitute material planning matters and do not affect the Officer recommendation. Similarly, the question of whether a charge for use of the car park is introduced in the future is not material to the determination of this planning application.
14. Paragraph 76 of the revised NPPF requires local planning authorities to assess why, for major development involving the provision of housing, any earlier grant of planning permission for a similar development on the same site did not start. In this instance, Officers understand that the developer

who intends to bring forward the scheme has changed since the original consent was granted and is seeking a number of amendments to the approved scheme to meet their requirements, hence the earlier development not having commenced. The reasoning behind each amendment is set out within the applicant's Design and Access Statement.

## **CONDITIONS**

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

1. No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) unless and until an investigation has been carried out to establish the presence, or otherwise, of Japanese knotweed within the site. The results of this investigation shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to any development taking place. Should the presence of this species be identified, no development shall take place unless and until an invasive non-native species protocol has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority detailing the containment, control and removal of Japanese knotweed on site. The measures shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: These details are required prior to commencement as removal of Japanese knotweed is essential before any development takes place. In the interests of removing an invasive non-native species which may exist on the site in accordance with Policy R2 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Page 29 93998/FUL/18: Bowdon Lawn Tennis Club, Elcho Road, Bowdon**

## **OBSERVATIONS**

Policy 47 of the Devisdale Conservation Area Management Plan states that *'lighting columns should... make use of energy efficient LEDs with warm bulbs'*.

Paragraph 20 of the main Committee report states that a planning condition would be required to ensure that the colour of the bulbs used in the installation is sufficiently warm to prevent any adverse impact on visual amenity. This is carried through into Condition 3 in the recommendation.

Prior to determination and to avoid the need to discharge a pre-commencement planning condition, the applicant has submitted a specification for the bulbs to be used which indicates that they are to have a colour temperature of 5000K. This is a mid-range colour temperature and is a white, rather than yellow, light. It is however considered to be sufficiently warm to not have any adverse impact on visual amenity or the character, appearance or significance of the Devisdale Conservation Area or any other designated or non-designated heritage asset. Warmer colour temperature bulbs are available but would result in a larger

number of lighting columns being required to illuminate the courts, which would have a greater visual impact. On balance, the 5000K colour temperature bulb is considered to be an appropriate solution and would not alter the conclusions in the main report that 'less than substantial harm' has been identified to a heritage asset but which is outweighed by the public benefit of the proposals.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Delete Condition 3.

**Page 47 94257/FUL/18: 211 Dane Road, Sale**

**SPEAKER(S)**            **AGAINST:**        **Miss Amanda Hilton**  
(Recommendation)

**FOR:**

### **CONSULTATIONS**

**Pollution and Housing** – have no objections in principle to this application. Recommend a condition to restrict the hours of use of the outdoor play areas to allow neighbouring residential occupiers suitable periods of 'respite' from the noise associated with outdoor play.

It is also recommended that a condition be applied to restrict the use of elevated play platforms, ensure the installation of soft play surfaces, and the implementation of an outdoor noise management plan.

**Local Highway Authority** – indicate that the proposals are not clear whether one or two gates are proposed across the new gated entrance and recommend a single gate to avoid obstructing car parking spaces. This should remain open during hours of operation. The access should be a minimum of 4.5m wide. The level of parking proposed meets with the level indicated in the SPD.

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

Following publication of the Committee report three additional letters of support, including two from a single property and one from a neighbouring property that previously commented in support of the application have been received. Issues raised include:

- Council have recently approved 14 houses in Clarendon Crescent and if each has 2 cars that will be a total of 28. There will also be children playing. If these were considered acceptable then same consideration should apply here.
- Supporting a local business.
- Additional children will gain from the care provided and the demand for childcare increases as more families move into Trafford.
- Noise from children not a negative thing, given the proximity of existing schools, Dane Road and the M60.

The applicant has indicated their concern that where representations are reported within the main Committee report the phrase *'What allowances have been made for a possible 30 extra cars dropping off children'*, which was included in one of the original representations, had not been removed from the report when a subsequent representation has been made by the same property. In response, the report summarises comments made and this was raised as an issue of concern which it was considered proper to bring to Members' attention. Whilst a further supportive email was received from this property it did not specifically indicate that their earlier comments had been withdrawn or were superseded.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

### **Residential Amenity**

The paragraph references below are to those in the main Committee report.

Paragraph 11. The applicant has stated that Paragraph 11 quotes 90sqm and 160sqm for the play areas whereas their architect has shown this to be 110sqm and 160sqm respectively. Officers have measured the play area at c.225sqm but even if the measurements shown on the submitted plan are taken as read this gives a total of 270sqm of play area. The standard is that in excess of 10sqm per child should be provided per child i.e. 300sq.m in order that there would be a sufficiently large garden. The Planning Guidelines – Day Nurseries and Playgroups indicate that an ideal property would meet this criterion in order to ensure outdoor play is not unduly close to neighbouring properties. As the premises is small there will be pressure on the outdoor space and it is not appropriate or reasonable to impose a condition requiring children to be taken off the premises for certain periods of time. It remains Officers' view that the outside play area is not sufficient for the scale of day nursery proposed.

Paragraph 13. This mentions 15 children leaving the property in the morning, the applicant has asked that it be clarified that 15 children would also go out in the afternoon.

Paragraph 13 states the garden at 211 Dane Road will be in close proximity to the gardens at 209 Dane Road and 140 Arnesby Avenue and the applicant considers this inaccurate. The play areas extend to the boundary with No. 209 Dane Road and the rear play area is within 9.5m of the boundary with 140 Arnesby Avenue. A normal timber fence would have little impact on the transmission of noise.

Paragraphs 13 and 15 mention if play equipment was installed then it is possible that undue overlooking would occur. The applicant has clarified that no such equipment is part of the proposal. This is noted but it is considered that a condition restricting this could be seen to be unreasonable.

Paragraph 14. The applicant has questioned the relevance of the level of traffic on Dane Road. This aspect has been raised in representations received and vehicles parked on Dane Road while dropping off at the nursery could lead to



additional congestion and road safety issues. The level of traffic on Dane Road must be a material consideration when assessing the scheme.

Paragraph 16. It is considered that green mesh fencing would be more typical of a larger school site than this residential scale property. It would however be considered that if the application were acceptable in other respects it could be adequately screened by planting if set on the inner side.

Background noise levels from nearby schools and roads, although acknowledged, would be limited and are not considered to be sufficiently high that they would effectively mask or mitigate the noise which would be experienced by neighbours from the proposed use.

### **Parking**

The applicant has indicated that in over the 13 years of running her current business 90% of those attending walk/bike/scoot to the setting and are not driven and considers this can be evidenced. The applicant's current operation is a child care provision in a domestic setting with part of the property in residential use and is not of the scale proposed for this day nursery. In this case the level of car use would be expected to be significantly higher and the figure given in the Council's SPD is an appropriate guide.

It is necessary to assess the application on a "worst case scenario" and whilst the applicant may run the business in a particular way, planning permission runs with the land and not the individual and grants permission for a use rather than a specific operation. The 90% figure cannot be guaranteed and a condition which attempted to control this would be unreasonable and unenforceable.

### **Other matters**

The issues raised by the LHA in respect of the width of the access and the provision of a single, rather than double gates, kept open during hours of operation, could be controlled by condition were the application otherwise acceptable.

The reference to the approval of a housing application at Clarendon Crescent is not considered to be of sufficient similarity to this proposal to represent a meaningful comparison.

The benefits of the proposal, which include supporting a local business and providing additional child care places, are acknowledged, but in this particular case the harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties that would arise and the conflict with the development plan is considered to outweigh these benefits.

### **CONCLUSION**

The applicant's suggestions of planning conditions to impose controls on the operation of the business and those put forward by the EHO are noted. None, however, are considered to meet all of the six tests for conditions set out in the NPPG, particularly in respect of enforceability and reasonableness. It would be impossible to effectively monitor the operation of these restrictions in practice, for

example, the numbers of those dropping off by car, or children leaving the nursery site for an external activity, on a day to day basis. It is therefore considered that despite suggestions of suitable planning conditions, none would effectively or lawfully mitigate the harm that would be caused by the development. As such the recommendation stands to refuse planning permission. To provide greater clarity, the wording of the reason is amended as set out below.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The proposed development, by reason of the use of the garden for outdoor play and the close proximity of the parking area to residential properties and the associated vehicular and pedestrian movements, would result in undue noise and disturbance and an undue loss of privacy to the occupants of neighbouring properties and would therefore have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity that the occupiers of these properties could reasonably expect to enjoy. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy, guidance contained within the Council's Planning Guidelines – Day Nurseries and Play Groups and the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### **Page 56 94319/FUL/18: 199 Ashley Road, Hale**

<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	<b>Mrs Colette Foan (Neighbour)</b>
	<b>FOR:</b>	<b>Mrs Alison Freeman (Agent)</b>

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

**Further clarification is provided below in respect of the summary of representations received in relation to the originally submitted plans and those received following the further consultation on the revised proposals:**

#### **Original Scheme**

Multiple letters of objection have been received from five neighbouring addresses in response to the original proposal. These letters raise the following issues:

- The proposed development would be too large for the area and would back onto residential properties;
- The development would result in an unacceptable noise impact on neighbouring residential properties;
- The alleyway to the side of the building would channel noise to surrounding properties;
- The submitted noise report is imprecise;

- The proposed hours of operation would be too long;
- The pavement where the proposed street side external dining area would be situated is not part of the property. There have been problems with similar elements elsewhere within Hale;
- The external dining area would undermine the street scene and obstruct the pavement;
- The proposed awnings are not commonly in use on Ashley Road;
- The proposed rear facing first floor windows would result in an unacceptable privacy impact on the dwelling to the rear;
- The proposed first floor rear extension would result in an unacceptable overbearing and overshadowing impact on the dwelling to the rear;
- The applicant is incorrect in their claim that Hale town centre is declining with multiple empty properties;
- Hale does not need another restaurant;
- The proposal would result in an unacceptable parking impact;
- It would result in an overdevelopment of the plot;

The applicant should consider using one of the currently vacant former restaurants.

### Revised Scheme

Two representations have been received from a single address in response to the revised proposal. These representations raise the following issues:

- The amended rear extensions would continue to result in an imposing and oppressive overlooking and overbearing impact which would set a negative precedent for future development in the local area. The amended proposal should be further reduced to address their concern;
- A continued concern that noise from the proposed front external dining area would result in an unacceptable amenity impact on surrounding properties, with noise being funnelled by side alleys. The external dining area would also result in an obstruction;
- A concern that the proposed external extraction equipment would result in an unacceptable noise and odour impact. The proposed AC units should be relocated to the front balcony;

- Should planning permission be granted this should be subject to a condition requiring a high standard of wall insulation to ensure an acceptable noise amenity impact. Further conditions should be included to ensure the proposed roof light is sealed and sound insulated, the rear facing windows are kept closed and obscurely glazed, and that the AC conditions should be adequately maintained;
- The proposed opening hours are too late and should cease at 2300 each day. Music should cease by 2200. Bottle tipping should not take place from 2100 to 0900 each day.

## **FURTHER INFORMATION FROM THE APPLICANT**

Three further pieces of correspondence have been received from the applicant:

- Further information has been received from the applicant responding to the neighbour request that noise mitigation is applied to the alleyway between the application site and the adjacent building to the south-west. This response quotes a comment from the applicant's noise consultee which states:

*Noise from the external area to the front of the premises will not reflect down the alleyway to the side of the building and impact on the residential properties to the rear at a significant level. This is a very long path for the noise to travel, there are a number of obstacles, as the noise reflects off objects and walls it reduces in noise level. Therefore, there will no significant noise being reflected back to these gardens.*

The applicant further states that the front seating area would be set in from the alleyway and therefore would be 'well away'. Use of the alleyway would also be restricted as per the recommended condition.

- Further information has been received from the applicant stating the scheme has been much reduced from the originally submitted scheme; that the neighbour concerns raised regarding noise from another nearby restaurant cannot apply to the current proposal because the neighbouring restaurant has a back yard which is used as an external dining and drinking area; and that the amended scheme will result in an acceptable noise amenity and visual impact on surrounding properties. A letter has been received from the applicant which has also been sent to councillors and outlines the fact that prior to the current application they obtained pre-application advice from the local planning authority which the applicant has sought to incorporate in the submitted scheme, as well as the fact that the current scheme to be considered at Committee has been amended in response to planning officers' advice during the course of the planning application. The letter states that the applicant is a local resident and is committed to investing in Hale and to working with all neighbours and local councillors. The letter also refers to the fact a site meeting took place with concerned local residents, Councillor Young and the case officer which

outlined an interim revision of the proposals and gave concerned parties the opportunity to visit the site.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

In response to the further objections to the amended scheme, the Nuisance consultee has confirmed that the noise and amenity conditions as set out within the Committee report are acceptable. The other issues are considered to have been addressed in the Observations section of the report.

### **Page 76 94416/HHA/18: 11 Haydock Drive, Timperley**

**SPEAKER(S)**      **AGAINST:**      **Mrs Martine Harrop  
(Neighbour)**

**FOR:**

### **Page 83 94747/FUL/18: Former Kelloggs Building, Talbot Road, Stretford**

**SPEAKER(S)**      **AGAINST:**      **John Westbrook  
(Local Resident)**

**FOR:**      **Mrs Rhian Smith  
(Agent)**

## **CONSULTATIONS**

**Local Highway Authority:** No objection subject to Travel Plan, Car Park Management Strategy and cycle parking conditions.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

### **PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT**

1. The Committee Report considers concerns raised in representations that the application is premature and refers to guidance contained within the NPPG to conclude that this is not a matter for which permission should be refused. Officer would also like to note that the revised NPPF also contains policies which support this conclusion, specifically paragraphs 47-50.
2. Paragraph 49 notes that “...arguments that an application is premature are unlikely to justify a refusal of planning permission other than in the limited circumstances where both:

- a) *the development proposed is so substantial, or its cumulative effect would be so significant, that to grant permission would undermine the plan-making process by predetermining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to an emerging plan; and*
  - b) *the emerging plan is at an advanced stage but is not yet formally part of the development plan for the area.”*
3. Paragraph 50 goes on to say that *“Refusal of planning permission on grounds of prematurity will seldom be justified where a draft plan has yet to be submitted for examination”*.
  4. The proposed development would not fall within either of the two circumstances above and would not affect the development plan making process. As such, the conclusions of the Committee Report are deemed to remain valid in this respect.

## HIGHWAY MATTERS

5. The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has provided comments on the application since the Committee Report was published. These comments note that the proposals will reduce the overall traffic generation of the site and therefore will not have an impact on the surrounding highway network.
6. With regard to parking, these comments state that a total of 376 spaces are required to meet the maximum SPD3 standard and given that 421 spaces exist, sufficient space is available for both uses of the building. In terms of cycle parking, it is noted that, from the information provided, the total number of cycle spaces shown is below the SPD3 standard and it is not clear whether the cycle parking proposed would be sheltered.
7. Overall, the LHA raises no objections to the application subject to conditions requiring the submission of a full Travel Plan, a Car Park Management Strategy and full details of cycle parking provision. Appropriate conditions to this effect are already included within the Committee Report recommendation and as such, it is considered that no further conditions are required.
8. It is considered that the matters raised by the LHA have been appropriately addressed and do not indicate that an alternative recommendation should be made. The shortfall in cycle parking below SPD3 standards has been addressed in full in the main report and found to be acceptable for the reasons given.

## PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

9. Officers wish to confirm that as the proposal is deemed to accord with the Development Plan which is up to date in respect of the policies relevant to

this application, and therefore in accordance with paragraph 11 (c) of the NPPF, the application should be approved 'without delay'.

**RICHARD ROE, CORPORATE DIRECTOR OF PLACE**

**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**