

AGENDA ITEM 5

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 5th March 2020

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
<u>96337</u>	772-776 Chester Road, Stretford, M32 0GE	Gorse Hill	1		
<u>97665</u>	Corner of St. Margaret's Road and Groby Road, Bowdon	Bowdon	22		
<u>97879</u>	125 Church Lane, Sale, M33 5GH	Ashton On Mersey	43		✓
<u>97897</u>	Land North of Oak Road and West of Warburton Lane, Partington	Bucklow St Martins	60		✓
<u>98934</u>	Altrincham Grammar School Sixth Form Centre, Green Courts, Bowdon, WA14 2SR	Bowdon	106		✓
<u>99245</u>	Land known as Carrington Village On Land Off Manchester Road, Carrington	Bucklow St Martins	144	✓✓	✓
<u>99423</u>	Firs Primary School, Firs Road, Sale, M33 5EL	St Marys	247		

99489	Eventcity, Barton Dock Road, Trafford Park, M41 7TB	Davyhulme East	255	✓	✓
99502	Worthington Primary School, Worthington Road, Sale, M33 2JJ	Sale Moor	300		

Page 43 97879/HHA/19: 125 Church Lane, Sale, M33 5GH

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

**FOR: Charles Coxon
(on behalf of Applicant)**

REPRESENTATIONS

No further comments have been received.

CONSULTATIONS

Local Highway Authority – There are no objections on highways grounds to the proposal and agree with the conclusions in the main report. The gates, being set back from the highway by 9m, would comply with SPD3.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation remains unchanged.

Page 60 97897/FUL/19: Land North of Oak Road and West of Warburton Lane, Partington

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

**FOR: Bill Fulster
(Agent)**

The application has also been referred to the Committee as the Council owns a large part of the site.

OBSERVATIONS

An additional objection has been received however the issues raised are covered within the original officer report.

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has submitted details of the curved wall to be located at the main vehicular access to the site (indicated on the previously submitted landscape plan) and has asked that it be added to the list of approved plans.

The applicant has requested that Condition 12 is deleted, which requires no more than 50 units on the application site to be occupied before either the Carrington Relief Road or the Flixton Road Junction Improvement is delivered, as the delivery of these highway improvements is outwith the applicant's control. The applicant is however willing to accept a revision to Condition 11, which requires the demolition of 50 residential units on Tulip Road, before any occupation of the development takes place, to increase the number of units to be demolished to 75 – the same number as are proposed in this application.

OBSERVATIONS

Design

The design of the proposed curved section of wall either side of the vehicular access to define the main entrance to the site is considered acceptable and comprises a 1.463 metre high brick wall with contrasting colour bands and terminating either end in brick piers to a maximum height of 1.71m.

Highways

Officers consider, and are advised by the Local Highway Authority, that due to the cumulative highways impacts of other committed developments in the vicinity of the application site, any additional trip generation onto the A6144 would have a 'severe' impact on the highway network in NPPF terms. As such relevant Grampian conditions (Conditions 11 and 12) were included in the recommendation to ensure that (i) for occupation of the development up to 50 units there is no net increase in trip generation and (ii) for occupation of the development over 50 units (up to a total of 75) required highways improvements were in place in the form of either the CRR or at the Flixton Road junction to mitigate the impacts of the additional trips and make the development acceptable in planning terms.

The applicant's request to amend Condition 11 to require 75 units to be demolished on Tulip Road would equally lead to no net increase in trip generation, but for the entirety of the development rather than just part. Consequently, with the proposed amendments to Condition 11 there would be no 'severe' impact arising on the highway network as a result of the proposals. This makes Condition 12 unnecessary as there is no need for any mitigation. The recommendation has been amended accordingly.

Public Sector Equality Duty

Due regard should be had for the three aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty in the consideration of this application. In particular, regard should be given to the rehoming of residents from properties within Your Housing Group's stock into the application site, following the demolition of those properties. The applicant has identified that there are tenants who may have protected characteristics within the dwellings to be demolished, however is satisfied that the proposed accommodation within the development would be suitable to house tenants within any protected group. At present the applicant has not identified any tenants with accessibility needs who would require specialised adaptations.

This application does not seek permission for the demolition of the existing residential units within Your Housing Group's stock and at present, this demolition does not benefit from planning permission. An application for prior approval will be required for their demolition and the PSED will be engaged in the determination of that application. The demolition is required to enable the highways impacts of this development to be acceptable but otherwise does not form part of the consideration of these proposals. Condition 11 does not permit the demolition of the properties. If and when an application comes forward for the demolition of these properties, the potential impact of that demolition on protected groups will be considered in the determination of that application.

Other Matters

With regard to concerns stated about the potential re-opening of the path to the side of No. 9 Rutland Road, this is not part of the proposed masterplan for the site. The boundary of No. 9 would adjoin the boundary of the proposed semi-detached dwelling at Plot 54 effectively securing the side boundary of the site from public access.

PLANNING BALANCE

Following the applicants request to update the conditions as detailed above, that 75 existing units within Your Housing Group stock in Partington should be demolished before any part of the development is occupied; the development would not result in a net increase in dwellings. Therefore no benefit to be afforded in respect of additional residential dwellings and towards addressing the housing land supply shortfall from this development.

Notwithstanding this the other benefits of the scheme as detailed within the officer report, namely the provision of 100% affordable housing with a mix of 50 shared ownership units and 25 affordable rent units, along with the regenerative benefits of a well-designed high quality scheme, are considered to remain and would demonstrable and significantly outweigh the adverse impacts of the development.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation to **GRANT** is unchanged subject to the following revisions to conditions:-

Condition 2 to include the following additional plan:-

Oak Road / Entrance Wall detail Rev - Date FEB.20

Condition 11 to be replaced with the following:-

No residential unit hereby permitted shall be occupied unless and until the demolition of 75 existing residential units within Your Housing Groups stock within Partington has taken place, and that the Local Planning Authority have been able to confirm in writing that demolition has taken place through the submission and approval by the Local Planning Authority of a plan which identifies those units.

Reason: To ensure the highways impacts of the development are appropriately mitigated in the interest of highway safety and the free-flow of traffic, having regard to Policies L3, L4 and L7 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 12 to be deleted (and consequential renumbering of conditions).

Page 106 98934/FUL/19: Altrincham Grammar School Sixth Form Centre, Green Courts, Bowdon, WA14 2SR

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

FOR:

**Gillian Worden
(Agent)**

OBSERVATIONS

Within the 'Consultations' section of the report, it is noted the Local Highway Authority requested a condition (among others) in relation to an Event Parking Management Plan. Such a condition was not imposed and the report did not clarify the reasoning for not including an Event Parking Management Plan condition.

For clarity, a condition requiring an Event Parking Management Plan was not imposed as the proposed development would not impact on these existing community facilities. Details of parking management relating to the proposed development would be secured by way of the Travel Plan condition, which will seek a parking strategy and management plan for the community uses of the proposed sports hall.

The condition in relation to the Travel Plan (condition 14) is to be altered to include further clarity. Furthermore the wording of condition 13 is to be re-worded to follow best practice.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation to **GRANT SUBJECT TO LEGAL AGREEMENT** is unchanged, subject to a revision to Condition 13 and 14.

It is recommended that Condition 13 is amended as follows:

13. The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless and until the car parking shown on approved layout drawing no 14-089-1120-C is made available for use and shall be retained as such thereafter for users of Altrincham Grammar School for Girls, including community users and for no other purpose.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and the free flow of traffic and in accordance with Trafford Core Strategy Policies L4 and L7 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

It is recommended that Condition 14 is amended as follows:

14. The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless and until a full Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The travel plan shall include:

- a) Realistic and quantifiable targets to reduce car travel and increase use of non-car modes. The targets will be reviewed and monitored against the baseline which will be established within 3-months of planning permission being granted;
- b) Effective measures to promote sustainable transport options for staff, pupils, parents/guardians, relevant clubs and groups, and guests; and
- c) A car parking management plan and parking strategy, which details the management of all on-site parking spaces within the school campus (across the three sites) for school and community uses including the development hereby approved.

The travel plan shall be implemented for a period of not less than ten years from the first date of operation. Annual travel survey surveys shall be completed every 12-months from the date planning permission is granted.

Reason: To reduce car travel to and from the site in the interests of sustainability and highway safety, having regard to Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Page 144 99245/OUT/19: Land Known As Carrington Village on Land Off Manchester Road, Carrington

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Anna Chopping
(Friends of Carrington Moss)
Alistair Watson
(on behalf of Burford Carrington Ltd)**

**FOR: Dave Rolinson
(on behalf of Applicant)**

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The two full applications for residential development at Warburton Lane, Warburton (application nos. 98029/FUL/19 and 98030/FUL/19) described as not yet determined in the report have since been withdrawn. For the avoidance of doubt the concurrent outline application for this same site remains the subject of an appeal against non-determination as set out in the report to the previous meeting of this Committee.

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has submitted a response to the Committee Report suggesting there are a number of areas that need to be corrected or clarified. These are summarised below, with a further response where necessary. The applicant has also requested amendments to a number of conditions and where these are considered acceptable the amended conditions are set out below.

CONSULTATIONS

Carrington Parish Council – Object for the following reasons: -

- The Parish Council welcomed the original proposal of the Carrington relief road that depicted the relief road commencing at Common Lane and then joining up with the A road, which would then eventually meet up with Carrington Lane near the Carrington Spur.
- It has since become apparent that the initial proposal has been amended showing that the relief road will now start at Carrington Business Park and follow the aforementioned route.
- The Parish Council will be/are objecting to the second amended proposal of the relief road as this new position will not alleviate any of the traffic through the village, which currently has properties that are already experiencing crack in walls etc. due to an increase of HGV vehicles travelling to the new HIMOR warehouse development on Manchester Road. The traffic from the larger corporations i.e. Air Products, the Power Station and Saica, will ultimately still have to 'trundle' most of the way through the village before it reaches the amended 2nd proposed road starting at Carrington Business Park. Where as in the first proposal there

would be no need to use the A6144 as they would use the relief road, thus reducing the traffic through Carrington village tenfold.

- The general consensus of the Parish and Parishioners alike agree that this amended 2nd proposal will have no benefit whatsoever to Carrington and if there is a dispute with the landowners and HIMOR around the Common Lane area this should be sorted asap.

LHA – Further comments summarised as follows: -

- The LHA is satisfied with the proposed accesses as detailed in the latest drawings and that issues raised in the Road Safety Audit can be addressed at the detailed design stage.
- The proposed pedestrian and cycle access arrangements are acceptable provided the applicant's response to issues raised by the LHA concerning the security of cycle routes can be conditioned as part of detailed design going forward.
- The LHA is satisfied that, in conjunction with the Grampian condition suggested, the proposals reasonably satisfy the criteria of generating equal or lesser trips than that generated by the extant permissions.
- Some discrepancies within the TA in terms of both survey work and traffic flows has been noted by the LHA, however as they do not affect the total traffic generated by the development compared to the extant permissions, the LHA consider them to be immaterial.
- Issues raised by the LHA over the Framework Travel will be addressed with submission of a revised Framework Travel Plan, in addition to Travel Plans for each phase.
- The LHA reiterates its concern that no modelling has been performed to ascertain whether the safeguarded movement corridor provides sufficient space for the Carrington Relief Road.
- Conditions are recommended to require the following: detailed designs of the access points, pedestrian facilities and cycle facilities; revised Framework Travel Plan and a Travel Plan for each phase; Construction Method Statement; and cycle parking and storage arrangements.

United Utilities - Recommend amendments to conditions to strengthen the need for infiltration testing and to ensure the necessary details are submitted to fully assess the surface water design. These have been considered and advice has been sought from the LLFA and it is considered the amendments requested are not necessary, since the issues raised can be considered in the discharge of conditions already recommended by United Utilities, the LLFA and the Environment Agency.

REPRESENTATIONS

A further representation on behalf of Burford Carrington Ltd has been submitted, summarised as follows: -

- It appears that the objection has been ignored on the basis that the Burford land is not in the Core Strategy, and the representations have

been submitted too late. Burford's rail land and sidings offer a strategic opportunity to introduce much needed rail served logistics.

- The report has made no comment on the proposed (and perverse) re-routing of the A1 road; proposed solely to avoid inclusion of the Burford land in the application proposals.
- Bearing in mind the substantial size of Burford's landholding (14.45 acres) which has not been included within the proposed development, this is contrary to NPPF paragraphs 117, 118 a) and b) (Making effective use of land) and 127 a) and e) (Achieving well-designed spaces).
- The objection needs to be properly and fully understood by the Council Members, officers and the applicant. A meeting is requested with a view to properly reflecting NPPF and matters more generally and the application should be deferred. Burford are seeking a purposeful and collaborative approach with the applicant and the Council.
- Any draft section 106 agreement should be placed promptly on the planning register so Burford will be able to monitor any negotiations.

OBSERVATIONS

Carrington Relief Road/Education Contribution

The applicant has advised that the CRR/education contribution has been presented incorrectly, including the adverse impact weighing against the scheme in the conclusions on the planning balance. The CRR/education contribution is proposed as follows: -

The applicant will enter into a legal agreement to cover the costs of the CRR project up to a maximum of £500,000. This sum is to be used towards the progression of the CRR project. If upon completion of the 289th dwelling, the CRR is fully funded or the £500,000 is not required for the CRR, this £500,000 (or any remaining part thereof), shall be paid as an education contribution. Such sum would be in addition to the £236,890 payable on the occupation of the 33rd dwelling, meaning that up to £736,890 would be paid towards primary education.

The above does still mean there is a potential scenario that the full education contribution may not be realised, however this potential adverse impact of the scheme has been considered alongside the fact that instead of a full education contribution being guaranteed from the outset, £500,000 of that contribution would be used to progress the CRR scheme to the next stage.

CRR Land

The applicant has requested that the lost development value to the applicant of the land to be provided for the CRR is confirmed. The applicant has stated this is £2,058,000 (this value has not been verified and accepted by the Council).

The applicant has requested that the offer to dedicate the land for the CRR to the Council is included within the heads of terms for the Section 106 agreement. This

is not considered necessary to make the proposed development acceptable and the potential CRR through the application site could proceed with or without this land being dedicated to the Council as part of this application, therefore it is not proposed that this forms part of the S106 agreement.

Public Transport

The applicant has requested that the proposed public transport improvements are included in the planning balance as part of the scheme benefits. This is accepted, although it is important to acknowledge that the proposed measures are not considered to go far enough to promote and improve public transport infrastructure to the extent that is needed in Carrington. It is accepted that they are nonetheless a benefit of the scheme and have been included accordingly where the planning balance is reassessed below.

Viability

The applicant strongly disputes the Council's assessment of the submitted viability case, as summarised in paragraph 189 of the report. The applicant has confirmed both the purchase price along with a detailed justification and recent examples of abnormal costs were provided by the applicant in response to this being requested (this is acknowledged, although the provision of this information didn't address the Council's concerns over the Viability Assessment). The applicant considers that the submitted Viability Assessment does meet the RICS Professional Guidance and guidance within Planning Policy Guidance. Notwithstanding this, given the need for expediency, the applicant has made the proposed planning obligation package as detailed in the report. Officers maintain that the viability case submitted by the applicant does not meet the required tests set out in the RICS guidance and PPG, as such it has not been given any weight in consideration of the scheme.

Noise/Air Products

The applicant has questioned why noise from Air Products is included as a negative within the planning balance of the report. The potential for infrequent operations at Air Products to result in noise that may impact on the amenity of future residents is identified as an adverse impact of the scheme. This was the case in assessment of the previous application and remains the case as there has been no material change in circumstances.

Fall-back Position

The applicant has emphasised the betterment provided by the application proposals compared to the fall-back position of the extant permission and requested that this is set out in further detail. The benefits of the scheme proposed in the current application compared to the extant scheme are set out in paragraphs 211 and 212 of the report and further assessment of the fall-back position is not considered necessary.

Affordable Housing

An amendment to the wording of the proposed affordable housing is proposed for clarity: 10% on site provision per phase of development and to be split 50:50 between affordable rent and shared ownership housing units and 50:50 between 1 and 2 bed dwellinghouses and/or apartments, and 3 bed dwellinghouses.

LHA comments

The LHA has advised that the proposed pedestrian and cycle access arrangements are acceptable provided the applicant's response to issues raised concerning the security of cycle routes is conditioned as part of the detailed design going forward. It is considered these matters can be considered as part of the details required by Condition 12 which would require a site-wide Movement and Access Strategy to be submitted and approved prior to the first application for reserved matters.

Conditions 22 and 23 requiring implementation of the proposed priority junctions and pedestrian facilities have been amended to include a requirement for detailed designs to be submitted and approved, as requested by the LHA.

Condition 25 has been amended to require a revised Framework Travel Plan to be submitted and approved prior to any application for reserved matters, as requested by the LHA.

Burford comments

Burford's objection to this application on the grounds that it does not include their landholdings is entirely unreasonable. Their aspirations for their own land carry negligible weight in the determination of this planning application.

In the 1990s Burford sought to promote their landholdings to provide a rail based logistics terminal through a proposal progressed as part of the Council's 2006 Unitary Development Plan. However, the Inspector examining the 2006 UDP did not consider that there were the exceptional circumstances required to release land from the Green Belt through the plan making process (as the rail based logistics facility would also have required release of Green Belt land in separate ownership to Burford), and also considered that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate the need for a regional rail freight interchange and limited evidence as to why Carrington would be the best location, and deleted the draft policy. This was not a decision made by the Council.

The Core Strategy (the current adopted Development Plan) does not set out any policy requirement for Burford's rail land sidings to be considered as an opportunity to provide rail served logistics in this location. Nor have Burford submitted a planning application, which they have been at liberty to do at any time. Policy SL5 does not mention rail served logistics for the Carrington Strategic Location. Policy L4 states the Council will safeguard and promote the rail freight transport network and associated inter-modal freight transport facilities,

however it does not refer to Carrington or Burford's land. Burford have the ability to promote their land either through the GMSF, or by making a planning application.

Burford make reference to the fact that the report has commented on the Partington Branch line; this is in response to the fact that the former railway line is mentioned in their original representation.

Burford refer to the proposed re-routing of the A1 road in order to avoid inclusion of Burford's land. The proposed alignment of the Safeguarded Movement Corridor through the site as a potential route for the CRR, thus avoiding Burford's land, is not considered an issue for consideration in this application. The proposed alignment of the CRR would be a matter for consideration if and when a planning application for the CRR is submitted. Approval of the current application would not preclude the CRR being on a different alignment to that indicated i.e. along the full length of the A1 road if that is subsequently considered to be the preferred/viable route.

There is no requirement for this application to have included other land in separate ownership in order to deliver the aspirations of the Core Strategy for the Carrington Strategic Location. The scheme is considered to make effective use of land and will create a well-designed place as required by the NPPF, without the need to include Burford's land.

The Burford representation is critical of the Council's notification of the application, however Burford has been formally consulted on the application and given the opportunity to comment. A meeting with officers was also held whilst the application was under consideration. The application has also been widely publicised, both by the applicant prior to submission and by the Council with site notices and advertisement in the local press.

There are no valid planning reasons to defer the application in order to allow for further discussions with Burford to take place. The appropriate forum for Burford to promote the strategic opportunity of their land being able to provide either rail freight or other transport infrastructure is through the GMSF and Local Plan consultation process.

Other Matters

Any reference in the report to "rescinding" the Common Lane permission should be taken to mean that the applicant "will not implement" that planning permission.

Condition 5 amended to a maximum of 4,459 sq m of the employment floorspace to be occupied by uses falling within Use Class B1(a), rather than a percentage of the overall total floorspace.

Condition 9 amended to require a minimum of 221 of the residential units to be delivered as accommodation suitable for family living, rather than a percentage of the overall total.

Planning Balance

It is acknowledged that the public transport improvements that form part of the application can be considered as benefits of the scheme, since they will promote and improve public transport infrastructure in Carrington, albeit they are limited in nature and are not in themselves the 'substantial' improvements needed in Carrington and required by Policy SL5. No other matters raised by the applicant or in the further representations received are considered to alter the planning balance and conclusions set out in the report, that the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, although the tilted balance, given the harms, particularly in respect of a lack of a robust viability assessment, falls only marginally in favour of the proposed development.

RECOMMENDATION

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 / unilateral undertaking to secure:
 - Affordable Housing Scheme – 10% on site provision per phase of development and to be split 50:50 between affordable rent and shared ownership housing units and 50:50 between 1 and 2 bed dwellinghouses and/or apartments, and 3 bed dwellinghouses.
 - A contribution of £236,890 towards new and/or improvement of existing primary schools payable on occupation of the 33rd dwelling and a further contribution of £500,000 payable on occupation of the 289th dwelling on the assumption that the CRR progresses beyond the next funding gateway.
 - Provision of on-site green infrastructure/open space, management and maintenance;
 - Provision of on-site play facilities, management and maintenance;
 - Provision of replacement facilities for Carrington Rugby Club, including new pitch, training area and club house (replacement pitch to be constructed and made available for use before the existing pitch is decommissioned).
 - Replacement Rugby facilities to be constructed to RFU Guidance Specification and Sport England design guidance and to include community use within permitted hours.
 - Management and maintenance by the Rugby Club (or alternative body, including a management company).
 - Travel Plan Monitoring Fee (figure to be confirmed and agreed).

Amended conditions as follows: -

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) and the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) or any equivalent Order following the amendment, revocation and re-enactment thereof, no more than 4,459 sq m of the employment floorspace (gross external floor area) hereby approved shall be occupied by uses falling within Use Class B1 (a).

Reason: In the interests of protecting the health and vitality of nearby town centres, as B1 (a) is defined as a main town centre use and having regard to the data used in the submitted Transport Assessment to assess the traffic impact of the proposed development, having regard to Policies SL5, W2, L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. A minimum of 221 of the residential units hereby approved shall be delivered as accommodation suitable for family living. In determining whether a residential unit is suitable for family living regard shall be paid to particular needs in relation to the size of residential units, as identified within the Development Plan or any recognised regional / national standard that is in place at the time of any application for Reserved Matters for layout, appearance and scale but generally shall consist of properties containing three bedrooms or more and larger two bedroom units to meet a range of family circumstances.

Reason: To ensure the housing needs of the Borough are adequately met and in accordance with Policies SL5 and L2 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

22. The proposed priority junctions to serve the various development sectors from the A6144 Manchester Road, set out in the Site Access Key Plan and Site Access drawings nos. 1 to 5 (Drawing reference CAR-ARP-CV-ZZ-DR-PT-0001 Rev P04, CAR-ARP-CV-ZZ-DR-PT-0002 Rev P05, CAR-ARP-CV-ZZ-DR-PT-0003 Rev P05, CAR-ARP-CV-ZZ-DR-PT-0004 Rev P04, CAR-ARP-CV-ZZ-DR-PT-0005 Rev P04 and CAR-ARP-CV-ZZ-DR-PT-0006 Rev P03) shall be implemented in accordance with a detailed design scheme which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be made available for use prior to the occupation of buildings within the relevant phase of the development they are intended to serve.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory access provision is made for the development, having regard to Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

23. The off-site highway improvements specified on the Site Access drawings nos. 1 to 5 (Drawing reference CAR-ARP-CV-ZZ-DR-PT-0002 Rev P05, CAR-ARP-CV-ZZ-DR-PT-0003 Rev P05, CAR-ARP-CV-ZZ-DR-PT-0004 Rev P04, CAR-ARP-CV-ZZ-DR-PT-0005 Rev P04 and CAR-ARP-CV-ZZ-DR-PT-0006 Rev P03), including the replacement and new bus shelters, new pavement construction and pedestrian crossing proposals, shall be provided in accordance

with a detailed design scheme which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be completed prior to the occupation of buildings within the relevant phase of the development they are intended to serve.

Reason: In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety and to improve pedestrian accessibility to and from the site, having regard to Policies SL5, L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

25. Prior to the first application for Reserved Matters which includes layout and/or scale, a revised Framework Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any application for Reserved Matters which includes layout and / or scale for each phase shall be accompanied by a Full Travel Plan for that phase, which shall be in accordance with the approved Framework Travel Plan and shall include measurable targets for reducing car travel. On or before the first occupation of each phase the Travel Plan shall be implemented and thereafter shall continue to be implemented throughout a period of 10 (ten) years commencing on the date of first occupation.

Reason: To reduce car travel to and from the site in the interests of sustainability and highway safety, having regard to Policies SL5, L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

32. No development shall take place, within each phase, unless a scheme for that phase detailing the mitigation of all potential impacts of flood risk and a satisfactory surface water design, together with a timetable for implementation, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for that phase. The detailed scheme shall be in accordance with the outline details provided in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (Ref: CAR-ARP-CV-ZZ-RP-CD-00001 Rev A dated 6 December 2019) and associated documents (Dwg No. CAR-ARP-CV-ZZ-SK-CD-00012 / 3 February 2020) including improvement of the existing surface water disposal system. The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme.

Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site; to reduce the impact of flooding on the proposed development and future occupants in accordance with Policies L5, L7 and SL5 of the Trafford Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance.

43. Any applications for Reserved Matters for each phase of the development, which includes layout, appearance and/or landscaping, shall include a scheme for the provision of bat boxes and bird boxes within new buildings and/or on suitable trees within that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be installed prior to the occupation of that phase and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To mitigate the loss of bat roosts and bird habitat and enhance the biodiversity value of the site, having regard to Policy R2 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

44. Prior to the first application for Reserved Matters which includes layout and/or landscaping, a site-wide Habitat Creation and Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Habitat Creation and Management Plan shall incorporate features into the design of the development that will enhance the landscape, biodiversity and geodiversity value of the site, including details of habitat provision to be provided on and off-site and shall achieve a measureable net gain in biodiversity. Measureable net gain shall be calculated on a site-wide basis, utilising the availability of land within the red and blue edge as identified on drawing number 60428959 01_101 Rev B Site Boundary. The submitted Plan shall include details of the woodland planting and habitat to be created off-site identified within Part 2 – Ecology and Nature Conservation Technical Paper 5 of the Carrington Village at Future Carrington Environmental Statement (Revision D 25 October 2019). All applications for Reserved Matters which include layout and/or landscaping for each phase shall include a Habitat Creation and Management Plan for that phase which shall be in accordance with the approved site-wide Habitat Creation and Management Plan. All Habitat Creation and Management Plans shall include details for the long-term management and maintenance of habitats created on and off-site and a programme of bat box and bird box maintenance. The development shall be carried out and maintained in full accordance with the approved Habitat Creation and Management Plans.

Reason: To protect and enhance landscape character, biodiversity and geodiversity on the site, provide mitigation for the loss of woodland, hedges and habitat for breeding and wintering priority bird species and to ensure that habitat quality is maintained, having regard to its location and the nature of the proposed development and Policies SL5, L7, R2 and R3 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Page 255 99489/FUL/19: Eventcity, Barton Dock Road, Trafford Park, M41 7TB

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Richard Walters
(on behalf of Neighbour)**

**FOR: James Mark
(Applicant)**

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

The main committee report erroneously refers to the site being located within a 'Main Employment Area'.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The following application was not included within this section of the main committee report:

86837/FUL/15: The erection of a temporary site office and compound facility for a four year period for the construction of Metrolink Trafford Park Line – Approved with conditions 27/01/2016.

CONSULTATIONS

A further response has been received from TfGM (Highways). This notes that their previous comments regarding traffic generation and distribution are maintained, and concerns are raised that greater traffic volumes than those predicted could impact on tram journey times. This also reiterates the request for the applicant to fund a signal timing review and recommends that proposed changes to the Phoenix Way pedestrian crossing are removed from the scheme.

REPRESENTATIONS

Since the main committee report was published, a letter of objection on behalf of the neighbouring Regatta UK Headquarters has been received. This raises the following concerns:

- The access way from Mercury Way is not adopted and is owned by Regatta. For the Therme proposals to be delivered, pedestrians would have to access this third party land and physical changes to this access road would be required. These works would not receive consent from Regatta due to the impact that such an intensification of use of this route would have on the day to day operation of the Regatta HQ and its staff
- Proposed pedestrian crossing of Mercury Way will give rise to potential conflicts of operations and pedestrian safety. The close proximity to the junction and large volume of pedestrians using the route from the overflow car park would result in potential delays and conflicts at peak times
- The development is encouraging greater usage of the right of way across Regatta land from the canal towards Mercury Way
- Regatta boundary plan does not show the potential car park exit towards Mercury Way and has other discrepancies
- Potential overshadowing and glare impacts on Regatta showroom
- A detailed schedule of plant should be provided prior to determination

The applicant has provided some further information in response to this, which is addressed below. The following further comments have subsequently been submitted on behalf of Regatta:

- Inaccurate information provided regarding the ability of Therme to use the Regatta-owned access from Mercury Way

- Need to understand how amended pedestrian access route would be managed – consultees likely to need further reports and analysis
- Earlier meeting between applicant and Regatta concluded that plan showing works on Regatta’s land would not be supported

OBSERVATIONS

HIGHWAY MATTERS

1. With regard to the further response received from TfGM, the LHA has indicated (as set out in the main committee report) that it is satisfied with the proposed scheme in terms of its trip generation and associated impact on the highway network. Whilst it is acknowledged that TfGM has raised concerns regarding traffic generation and distribution, the comments of the LHA as statutory consultee carry substantial weight and Officers are reassured that the conclusions reached in this respect are robust. The applicant has agreed to a condition requiring a signal timing review to be carried out, as requested by TfGM. This should be attached to any consent issued.
2. The letter of objection received from the neighbouring Regatta HQ raises concerns regarding the pedestrian crossing of Mercury Way and associated pedestrian use of the access road from Mercury Way towards the secondary Therme entrance point. Specifically, this claims that the crossing will give rise to potential conflicts of operations and pedestrian safety, whilst the close proximity to the junction and volume of pedestrians using the route from the overflow car park would result in potential delays and conflicts at peak times. This also notes that the proposals include works to Regatta-owned land, consent for which would not be forthcoming from the landowner.
3. In response to this, the applicant has provided a revised version of the ‘Regatta Boundary General Arrangement’ plan which removes the works previously shown within the access route and effectively restricts pedestrian access along this route from the overflow car park, as well as restricting access for pedestrians and cyclists approaching from the Bridgewater Canal. In support of this, a revised pedestrian access route has been provided to show that pedestrians accessing the resort from the overflow car park would now do so via Mercury Way and Barton Dock Road, towards the primary entrance point. Whilst this is a greater distance than originally proposed, this would reduce the prospect of delays and conflict with vehicles given that this route would follow existing defined footways and crossings within the adopted highway. This is therefore considered to be an acceptable arrangement. Notwithstanding this, the LHA considers that the proposed zebra crossing of Mercury Way would be better located south of that currently shown on the plans. On this basis, it is recommended that the condition requiring the submission of a Traffic Management Plan is amended to require the inclusion of an alternative

scheme for this crossing, together with a detailed Pedestrian Access Strategy from the overflow car park.

4. The representation also refers to inaccuracies shown on the original 'Regatta Boundary General Arrangement'. Specifically, these relate to works to the highway on the access route from Mercury Way and details of the secondary egress ramp from the main car park. As noted above, the applicant has subsequently provided a revised version of this plan which removes the works previously shown to the highway on this route. This plan also includes the car park egress, as was shown on the original version of this plan (section D-DD). With regard to potential conflict associated with this egress and service vehicles entering the site, it is noted that the Traffic Management Plan setting out specific arrangements for this will be conditioned with any consent issued. On this basis, Officers are satisfied that this element of the scheme is acceptable on highway grounds.
5. It is confirmed that the amendments to the Phoenix Way crossing originally proposed have now been removed from the scheme, as stated in the main committee report.
6. For clarity, a total of 1599no car parking spaces would be provided; 939no of these at ground/lower ground level of the building and 660no within the overflow car park. This total is inclusive of 35no disabled car parking spaces and 45no electric vehicle charging spaces. As per the main committee report, the applicant has committed to providing a minimum of 66no disabled parking spaces, secured by condition.

NOISE AND VIBRATION

7. The representation suggests that details of plant and machinery should be provided prior to determination. The Council's Pollution and Housing section has recommended that these details are conditioned, as is the case for many large schemes. In any event, the relevant condition for this matter also includes acceptable limits on the noise levels of any plant to be installed on the building. For further reassurance, an additional criterion is included within this condition relating to noise levels at windows of adjacent office premises. On this basis, Officers are satisfied with the approach taken to this matter.

AMENITY

8. The representation raises concerns regarding potential overshadowing of the Regatta showroom areas and the potential impact this would have on this business. It is noted that this matter is addressed within paragraphs 79-83 of the main committee report and Officers are satisfied that the development is acceptable in this respect, with approximately 45m being retained between the proposed building and the showroom windows.

9. The representation also suggests that a glare assessment should be provided to consider the impacts on Regatta in this respect. A condition is listed on the main committee report requiring the submission of a glare assessment in respect of the Metrolink line, and this should be amended to include a requirement to also consider such impacts on surrounding transport infrastructure and land. On this basis, Officers are satisfied that this matter can be appropriately addressed.

TREES AND LANDSCAPING

10. It is acknowledged that the Council's adopted SPD1: Planning Obligations includes a figure of 1 tree per 30sqm of gross internal floorspace (or equivalent) as a suitable contribution towards on-site specific green infrastructure. For the proposed development, this would equate to over 3,300 trees. A detailed landscaping scheme is recommended via condition which will set out the exact level of green infrastructure to be provided and will allow a qualitative assessment of this to be made. As set out in the main committee report, indicative landscaping plans show a considerable amount of proposed planting which will increase canopy cover within the central areas of the site whilst significant soft landscaping would also be provided adjacent to site boundaries, within the garden areas and within the building itself. Officers are therefore satisfied that the development is acceptable in this respect.

OTHER BENEFITS ASSOCIATED WITH DEVELOPMENT

11. Whilst not specifically referred to in the main committee report, the supporting information submitted with the application sets out the benefits associated with the scheme, including positive public engagement, other pre-application engagement, job creation and economic effects. For clarity therefore, it is noted that the development is expected to support at least 146no permanent construction jobs and around 650no permanent full-time jobs once open. The development will also add approximately £82.3m gross value to the local economy during construction, £25m annually once operational as well as £8.6m per year from tourist expenditure. These benefits all weigh in favour of the proposed development.
12. It is also acknowledged that the applicant has engaged positively with the Local Planning Authority, Trafford Council Members, the local community and other stakeholders at pre-application stage. The proposal was also presented to a Places Matter Design Review, following which a number of positive amendments were made to the scheme.

LAND OWNERSHIP/ACCESS ISSUES

13. A number of land ownership issues are raised in the letter of representation. Ownership of land is not a planning issue per se and the applicant has confirmed that appropriate certificates were served on all land owners within the application site boundary, including Regatta.

Notwithstanding this, a revised version of the 'Regatta Boundary General Arrangement' plan has been submitted which removes any physical works proposed on land within Regatta's ownership.

14. The applicant also advises there is a right of access across the land owned by Regatta, so access for service vehicles and vehicles using the egress ramp from the main car park can be provided. Regatta disagrees with this assertion and clarification on this matter will be provided verbally at the committee meeting.

CONDITIONS

Condition 2 in the main committee report has been amended to remove the illustrative drawings from the approved plans, to include the amended 'Regatta Boundary General Arrangement' plan and to confirm that the amended pedestrian crossing of Phoenix Way does not have approval. Condition 14 has been amended to include the requirement to consider the Regatta building within the glare assessment, whilst the timing for the submission of information has been amended in condition 16. Conditions 18 and 23 have been amended as per this report. Condition 27 has also been amended to enable monitoring and flexibility of use of electric vehicle charging point provision. A new condition is included requiring a signal timing review to be carried out, as requested by TfGM.

The amended conditions should be worded as follows:

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the following submitted plans:

Plan Number	Drawing Title
1973-SK-009 (Rev A)	Regatta Boundary General Arrangement
1973-SK-010	Barton Square Boundary General Arrangement
1973-SK-011	Regatta Boundary Sections Sheet 1 of 2
1973-SK-012	Regatta Boundary Sections Sheet 2 of 2
1973-SK-014	Barton Square Boundary Sections Sheet 1 of 3
1973-SK-015	Barton Square Boundary Sections Sheet 2 of 3
1973-SK-016	Barton Square Boundary Sections Sheet 3 of 3
A01*	Site Plan
A02*	Basement -3.00m
A03*	Ground Floor +0.00m
A04*	First Floor +3.00m
A05*	Second Floor +8.00m
A06	Slide Tower
A07*	Roof Plan
A08	Sections I
A09	Sections II
A10	Elevations / Sections
A11	Details Façade + Roof

*Approval for these plans excludes the amendments shown to the pedestrian crossing on Phoenix Way.

Reason: To clarify the permission, having regard to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy.

14. No development shall take place, excluding works of demolition and site clearance, unless and until an assessment of the impact of glint and glare upon tram drivers, surrounding transport infrastructure and land has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. If identified as being necessary, a scheme to minimise dazzle to tram drivers and other receptors shall be included within the submitted assessment. The development shall be carried out in accordance with scheme approved under this condition.

Reason: In order to ensure the safe operation of the tramway and in the interests of amenity and highway safety, pursuant to Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

16. No works on the entrance plazas shall take place unless and until a detailed design of these plazas has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity having regard to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

18. No above-ground construction works shall take place unless and until details of the external appearance of all external fixed plant and equipment, including M&E equipment, and an assessment of noise from that plant and equipment have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall demonstrate that the following noise criteria will be met:

(a) The noise level from all fixed plant items operating under normal conditions (when rated in accordance with BS 4142: 2014) shall not exceed 63dB (LA_r) between 07.00 and 23.00hrs and 47dB (LA_r) between 23.00 and 07.00hrs on any day at the nearest existing residential receptors.

(b) The noise level from the operation of emergency plant (when rated in accordance with BS 4142: 2014) shall not exceed 73dB (LA_r) between 07.00 and 23.00hrs and 57dB (LA_r) between 23.00 and 07.00hrs on any day at the nearest existing residential receptors.

(c) The operational noise level from all site activities (other than fixed/emergency plant) (when rated in accordance with BS 4142: 2014)

shall not exceed 53dB (LA_r) between 07.00 and 23.00hrs and 37 dB (LA_r) between 23.00 and 07.00hrs on any day at the nearest existing residential receptors.

(d) The noise level from all fixed plant items operating under normal conditions shall not exceed a maximum level of 60dB (LA_{eq, 1 hour}) at 1m outside the windows of adjacent office premises.

External plant and equipment and M&E equipment shall be installed in accordance with the approved scheme, and any mitigation measures required to achieve compliance with the above noise criteria shall be installed prior to the development being brought into use and retained thereafter.

Reason: To minimise disturbance and nuisance to occupiers of nearby properties, having regard to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

23. The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless and until a Traffic Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include the following:

- (i) Measures for the management of vehicles accessing and moving within the site, including details of a scheme of Variable Message Signs and details of the operation of the overspill parking area
- (ii) Measures for the management of pedestrians and cyclists accessing and moving within the site, including a detailed Pedestrian Access Strategy from the overflow car park to the primary entrance point, with measures to prevent access towards the secondary entrance point
- (iii) Revised plans to show an alternative location for the Mercury Way zebra crossing to the south of the overflow car park access point
- (iv) Revised plans to show the provision of a minimum of 66no disabled car parking spaces and measures for monitoring the use of disabled parking facilities, with mechanisms for amending the level of disabled parking provision where necessary

The approved Plan shall be implemented and adhered to in full.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory provision is made within and around the site for the movement and management of vehicles attracted to or generated by the proposed development and in the interests of pedestrian and highway safety, having regard to Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

27. The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless and until a scheme for electric vehicle charging points (minimum 7kWh) and infrastructure (including those shown on drawing numbers A01 and A03) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall also include measures for monitoring the use of the

electric vehicle charging points with mechanisms for increasing the level of provision where necessary. The approved charging points and infrastructure shall be installed and made available for use upon the development being first brought into use and shall be 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.

New condition to be added:

32. The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use unless and until details of an agreement with Transport for Greater Manchester for the undertaking of a signal timing review has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The review shall be carried out in accordance with timings included in the submitted agreement.

Reason: In the interests of the safe and efficient operation of the surrounding highway network, in accordance with Policy L4 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Page 300 99502/FUL/19: Worthington Primary School, Worthington Road, Sale, M33 2JJ

RECOMMENDATION

Following the receipt of an additional detailed plan showing the proposed fencing and bin store, it is recommended that condition 2 is amended to include this plan: -

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers WPS-GA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-00-00001-S2-P0 Rev P3, WPS-GA-ZZ-00-DR-A-04-50400-S2 Rev P2, WPS-GA-ZZ-RF-DR-A-04-50402-S2 Rev P1, WPS-GA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-05-50501-S2 Rev P2, WPS-GA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-06-50601-S2 Rev P1, WPS-GA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-59001 Rev P3, WPS-GA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-92-59201-S2 Rev P2, WPS-GA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-92-59205-S1 Rev P0 and WPS-GA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-90-09002-S2-P0 Rev P1.

Reason: To clarify the permission, having regard to Policies L4 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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