

AGENDA ITEM 5

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 8th August 2019

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	For
96825	30 and 32 Derbyshire Lane, Stretford, M32 8BJ	Stretford	1	✓	✓
97046	6-10 Victoria Road, Hale, WA15 9AF	Hale Central	14		✓
97375	Hale Bowling Pavilion, Cecil Road, Hale, WA15 9NT	Hale Central	30	✓	✓
97376	Hale Library, Leigh Road, Hale, WA15 9BG	Hale Central	65	✓	✓
97477	Stretford Grammar School, Granby Road, Stretford, M32 8JB	Longford	99		
97492	5 Cranford Road, Flixton, M41 8PS	Davyhulme West	121	✓	✓
97607	School Development Site, Audley Avenue, Stretford	Gorse Hill	133		✓
97876	15 Carrsvale Avenue, Urmston, M41 5SX	Urmston	149		✓
98056	14 Sidmouth Avenue, Flixton, M41 8ST	Davyhulme West	160		

Page 1 96825/FUL/19: 30 and 32 Derbyshire Lane, Stretford.

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Dr. Richard Deloughry
(On behalf of Neighbours)**

**FOR: Mr Noel Tracey
(On behalf of Applicant)**

REPRESENTATIONS

A further representation has been received from a local resident raising a question regarding the neighbour notification process. The specifics relate to St Ann's Roman Catholic School and if the Diocese, as the owner of the school, should have been notified and if they have not whether the Planning Department followed the correct procedure as set out in the adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

OBSERVATIONS

The neighbour notification procedure requires that the adjoining/facing properties are consulted and letters are sent to these properties. Many occupiers of properties are not necessarily the owner, be it residential, commercial or in this case educational. It is not a requirement that the land registry details are checked for each property and the Council has therefore notified correctly and in accordance with adopted policy.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation is unchanged.

Page 14 97046/FUL/19: 6-10 Victoria Road, Hale

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

**FOR: Mr Jerry Spencer
(On behalf of Applicant)**

Page 30 97375/FUL/19: Hale Bowling Pavilion, Cecil Road, Hale.

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Mr Brian Kilshaw
(On behalf of Neighbours)**

**FOR: Mr Paul Luton
(On behalf of Applicant)**

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has supplied a further Statement of Community Involvement which provides an up-to-date position regarding responses received to the public exhibition (at the existing library) and ongoing community engagement. Key headline information from the recent statement includes:

- During the six weeks of the public exhibition, there were over 8,608 visitors to the library; an increase of 17% on the equivalent weeks last year; and
- Visitors were invited to join the project mailing list and, at the time of writing, there are 894 supporters on the email list plus approximately 50 others who have provided a postal address.

REPRESENTATIONS

Five further representations have been received in the period since the main officer report to the Planning and Development Management Committee was published. All are letters of objection, and thus the overall number of objectors is now 29. The points raised in the new representations can be summarised as:

- The proposed library building is too large and constitutes over-development;
- The development is out-of-keeping with a traditional village;
- The development is unsympathetic to surrounding residential properties and the bowling green;
- It would harm the conservation area and nearby listed buildings;
- The proposed materials of construction are inappropriate;
- The development would lead to loss of light for Cecil Road residents;
- It would lead to an increase in noise levels during evening hours;
- Anti-social behaviour at the site would be encouraged;
- The noise impact assessment was carried out during an uncharacteristically quiet period;
- There are too many rooms proposed within the building which would result in its overuse;
- There is no need for a community café;
- There are existing community buildings in Hale;
- It would lead to dangerous traffic congestion;
- The changes to the car park would create a hazard in respect of servicing to the Sainsbury's unit;
- It would reduce drivers' and pedestrian visibility in the car park;
- It would create extra parking problems;
- There would be a loss in car parking spaces;
- Car parking is already being lost in Hale due to the Brown Street development;
- Some of the proposed disability car parking spaces are not of the required dimensions;

- The car park survey was undertaken on the quietest day of the week;
- Emergency vehicles could not pass through the car park at pinch points;
- The grass of the bowling green is likely to be killed off;
- Mature trees and wildlife habitat would be lost;
- The retention of green spaces is important to health and well-being;
- The unused Hogan's of Hale building would be ideal for a library;
- There are other empty premises in Hale village that could be re-used instead;
- The footprint of hard development would increase which could increase the risk of surface-water flooding;
- There is a conflict of interest behind those involved in the process;
- It is incorrect to claim that the library would close without this development;
- No residents were consulted prior to the application being made; and
- The applicant's proposals for the construction period are unacceptable.

OBSERVATIONS

The majority of the matters raised in the recent objection letters are the same or similar to matters expressed in objections that were covered in the main officer report. However, some further commentary specifically regarding highways matters is provided below, following a further review by the LHA.

Highways Matters

It can be confirmed that:

- The proposed disability spaces are of the required dimensions;
- The Cecil Road car park would remain accessible by emergency vehicles;
- The proposal retains the overall number of car parking spaces (at Cecil Road) at 135;
- The proposal would not materially alter the existing servicing arrangements to the Sainsbury's unit;
- Conclusions regarding the car parking implications of the development have also taken into account a more recent Hale-wide car park survey which accompanied the Brown Street planning application (ref. 95514/FUL/18); and
- Proposals for the construction period have not been accepted, and it is the intention that a detailed scheme for car parking and access during the construction phase is requested via condition.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation is unchanged, subject to some minor revisions to conditions:

GRANT subject to the following conditions:

8. Notwithstanding the approved plans as referred to in condition no. 2 and the submitted Landscape Strategy (revision A) dated March 2019 and prepared by BCA Landscape, no above-ground construction works shall take place unless and until full details of all soft landscaping to be provided throughout the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include: the formation of any banks, terraces or other earthworks; planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants (noting species, which shall include native species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities); existing trees to be retained; and a planting implementation programme. The schedules of plants shall be based on the provision of at least eight new trees, and other planting, in accordance with paragraph 3.12 of the submitted landscape strategy and which shall also illustrate the provision of an additional tree within the vicinity of Tree T18 as defined by the submitted Tree Survey and Arboricultural Method Statement (dated March 2019, revised 3rd June 2019, and prepared by BCA Landscape). The soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and implementation programme.

Reason: To ensure that the site is satisfactorily landscaped and that replacement planting, including with biodiversity value, is provided, in accordance with Policy L7, Policy R2 and Policy R3 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. Any trees or shrubs planted in accordance with the approved landscaping works which are removed, die, become diseased or seriously damaged shall be replaced with new trees or shrubs of a similar size and species and planted in the next planting season.

Reason: To ensure that the site is satisfactorily landscaped and that replacement planting is provided, in accordance with Policy L7, Policy R2 and Policy R3 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Page 65 97376/FUL/19: Hale Library, Leigh Road, Hale.

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Mr Brian Kilshaw
(On behalf of Neighbours)**

**FOR: Mr Paul Luton
(On behalf of Applicant)**

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has supplied a further Statement of Community Involvement which provides an up-to-date position regarding responses received to the public

exhibition (at the existing library) and ongoing community engagement. Key headline information from the recent statement includes:

- During the six weeks of the public exhibition, there were over 8,608 visitors to the library; an increase of 17% on the equivalent weeks last year; and
- Visitors were invited to join the project mailing list and, at the time of writing, there are 894 supporters on the email list plus approximately 50 others who have provided a postal address.

REPRESENTATIONS

It is commented that several of the additional objections that have been submitted regarding the accompanying Cecil Road application (ref. 97375/FUL/19) also cited this application in general terms. However, the points of particular objection referred specifically to the Cecil Road development and thus they have been stated within that Additional Information Report.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation is unchanged, subject to some minor revisions to conditions:

GRANT subject to the following conditions:-

9. Notwithstanding the approved plans as referred to in condition no. 2 and the submitted Landscape Strategy dated March 2019 (Revision B) and prepared by BCA Landscape, no above-ground construction works shall take place unless and until full details of all soft landscaping to be provided throughout the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include: the formation of any banks, terraces or other earthworks; planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants (noting species, which shall include native species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities); existing trees to be retained; a planting implementation programme; and a landscape management and maintenance plan. The schedules of plants shall be based on the provision of at least six new trees, and other planting, in accordance with paragraph 3.6 of the submitted Landscape Strategy. The soft landscaping works shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved details, implementation programme and management plan.

Reason: To ensure that the site is satisfactorily landscaped and that replacement planting, including with biodiversity value, is provided, in accordance with Policy L7, Policy R2 and Policy R3 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

10. Any trees or shrubs planted in accordance with the approved landscaping works which are removed, die, become diseased or seriously damaged shall be replaced with new trees or shrubs of a similar size and species and planted in the next planting season.

Reason: To ensure that the site is satisfactorily landscaped and that replacement planting is provided, in accordance with Policy L7, Policy R2 and Policy R3 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Page 97477/FUL/19: Stretford Grammar School, Granby Road,
Stretford**

PROPOSAL

Since the Committee Report was published, the applicant has advised that the number of additional pupils, as a result of the proposed development will be 120, rather than the 160 as originally stated. The proposal is otherwise unchanged.

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

1. Officers' assessment of the principle of development and the 'very special circumstances' argument put forward by the applicant in relation to the site's location in the Green Belt was based upon an increase of 160no pupils associated with the proposed development. As noted above, the applicant has subsequently advised that the proposed extension enables an increase of 120no pupils (24no per year group) and has submitted a revised Planning Statement to reflect this.
2. The applicant's case for 'very special circumstances' in Green Belt terms was in part based upon benefits associated with an increase in the number of pupils attending the school. As this number is now reduced, the benefits associated with this are also reduced proportionately. Despite this reduction in additional pupil numbers, the applicant's overall case for 'very special circumstances' remains robust and Officers' conclusion that these clearly outweigh the identified Green Belt harm remains valid. As set out in the revised Planning Statement, the proportion of pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds attending the school would remain at 20%, increased from the current 12%.

HIGHWAY MATTERS

3. The main Committee Report concluded that an additional 160no pupils would be acceptable in terms of parking and highways impacts. The reduction in additional pupils to 120no would have less of an impact in this respect and is therefore also acceptable with regard to highway matters.

CONCLUSION AND PLANNING BALANCE

4. The conclusions set out in the main Committee Report remain valid. The reduction in the total number of additional pupils associated with the proposed development has reduced the benefits of the scheme proportionately in this respect, however the applicant's overall case for 'very special circumstances' remains robust and these are considered clearly outweigh the substantial harm to the Green Belt which has been identified by reason of the inappropriateness of the development in Green Belt terms and the very limited harm to openness. There is not considered to be 'any other harm' associated with the development which cannot be appropriately mitigated, where necessary. The Officer recommendation therefore remains as per the main Committee Report.

Page 121 97492/HHA/19: 5 Cranford Avenue, Urmston

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Mrs Louise Bissell
(Neighbour)**

**FOR: Mrs Nicola Duckworth
(Applicant)**

REPRESENTATIONS

Additional representations have been made by the occupiers of 3 Cranford Road since the publication of the main agenda. The additional representation has been uploaded on the Planning Portal and was sent to Members by Mrs Bissell on 1 August.

The objections contained within the additional representation are summarised below:

- The Committee report has missed out essential wording in summarising their objection.
- The two storey rear element proposal does not comply with guidelines.
- The proposed extension will have a flat roof; be inconsistent with the design of the area and be highly visible from their property.
- The two storey rear extension will be highly visible from No 3 Cranford Road and Chesham Avenue
- The dimensions are incorrect and have not been verified by the Planning Officer.
- By approving the application this sets precedent for future applications
- Construction will require encroaching onto land of No3.

The full wording of the part of the representation the objector considers has been misquoted is as follows:-

*“A **substantial 2-storey extension** to the rear of 5 Cranford Road **already exists** and was built to comply with the SPD4 guidelines. **The existing 2-storey extension protrudes by just over 3m to the rear and was setback from the side boundary by 1.5m to comply with section 3.4.3 of the guidelines.** The proposer wants to further extend onto the side of the existing rear extension and up to the boundary of No3 - **thereby extending upon an existing extension.** This would reduce the obligatory setback from 1.5m to 0.0m and therefore breach these guidelines”.*

OBSERVATIONS

Residential Amenity

The objector believes that in relation to the two storey rear extension the SPD4 guidelines have been misinterpreted by officers in recommending that the application be granted. This is not the case.

Where a rear extension is to be built close to a common boundary (either on the boundary, or within 150mm) then the maximum projection as set out in SPD4 is 1.5m for two storey extensions and 3.0m for two storey extensions. Where an extension is more than 150mm from the boundary, the depth of the extension may be increased by the same distance from the boundary.

In this case, there is already a two storey extension in situ which has been set away from the boundary by 1.5m in order to enable a 3m projection. The objector correctly states that the guidelines have been applied in requiring the existing extension to be set away from the boundary. **However, this does not prevent further extensions being built up to the boundary, as proposed, provided these also comply with the SPD4 guidance.** A two storey extension with a 1.5m projection and a single storey extension with a 3.0m projection sited between the existing extension and the boundary would comply with these guidelines. Had the original extension been proposed with a staggered rear elevation as is now proposed then it would have been granted planning permission in this form.

Design and Street Scene

There is no right to a view over private land. It is for this reason that the view from the neighbouring property of the flat roof element of the extension has been given less weight than the impact of the proposals on the street scene. The impact of the flat roofed extension is considered to be acceptable given its limited visibility.

Other matters

The exact position of the boundary line cannot be verified by the Planning Service (and officers should not attempt to) and is a private, civil matter between the applicant and their neighbour. The applicant has stated that the extension will be built on land in their ownership and this statement must be taken in good faith.

Officers have not measured the projection of the chimney breasts as it is irrelevant to the consideration of the planning application.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation remains unchanged.

Page 133 97607/VAR/19: School Development Site, Audley Avenue, Stretford

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	
	FOR:	Mrs Deborah Smith (Applicant)

OBSERVATIONS

HIGHWAY MATTERS

1. The Committee Report noted that the applicant has provided a detailed scheme of highway improvement works which was required by condition 12 of the original consent, and that a consultation response from the LHA was awaited. The LHA has advised that approval of these details cannot be forthcoming until the developer has submitted the proposed scheme to the appropriate section of the Local Highway Authority for a design review. As such, this condition will remain as per the original consent and as set out in the Committee Report.

Following the above comments the description of development is updated to remove reference to condition 12:

Application for variation of conditions 2, 10, 15, 16 on planning permission 94950/FUL/18 (Erection of new SEN school with associated infrastructure including access, parking and landscaping.). To include a 12 No. place nursery within the Orchards SEN Primary School.

Page 149 97876/HHA/19: 15 Carrsvale Avenue, Urmston

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	
	FOR:	Mr Chris Walker (Applicant)

RICHARD ROE, CORPORATE DIRECTOR, 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**