

AGENDA ITEM 3

PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT CONTROL) COMMITTEE – 8th January 2015

ADDENDUM TO THE AGENDA:

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT (INCLUDING SPEAKERS)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report summarises information received since the Agenda was compiled including, as appropriate, suggested amendments to recommendations in the light of that information. It also lists those people wishing to address the Committee.

1.2 Where the Council has received a request to address the Committee, the applications concerned will be considered first in the order indicated in the table below. The remaining applications will then be considered in the order shown on the original agenda unless indicated by the Chairman.

2.0 ITEM 4 – APPLICATIONS FOR PERMISSION TO DEVELOP, ETC.

REVISED ORDER OF AGENDA (SPEAKERS)

Part 1 Applications for Planning Permission					
Application	Site Address/Location of Development	Ward	Page	Speakers	
				Against	For
83878	57 Waverley Road, Sale, M33 7AY	Priory	1		✓
83886	Springvale, Wicker Lane, Hale Barns, WA15 0HQ	Hale Barns	10		✓
83887	Springvale, Wicker Lane, Hale Barns, WA15 0HQ	Hale Barns	22		✓
84110	33A Hawthorn Court, Hawthorn Road, Hale, WA15 9RQ	Hale Central	32	✓	
84118	Oldfield Brow Primary School, Taylor Road, Altrincham, WA14 4LE	Altrincham	43		

PART 1

Page 1 [83878/FULL/2014](#): 57 Waverley Road, Sale

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

FOR:

Andy Shaw
(Applicant)

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

**FOR: Ian Hunter
(Agent)**

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

A report entitled 'Response to Committee Report' has been submitted in support of the application and includes the following comments: -

- The original dwelling and its associated barn are no longer easily distinguishable from one another due to having been extended and added to in a piecemeal fashion over a number of years. The loss of distinction of the two properties has already occurred prior to this application and to continue to assess the proposals against the benchmark of two separately listed properties is counterproductive.
- At the front of the property the two elements of house and barn can be readily identified and this relationship would not change. The gap between the main dwelling and former barns can only be viewed from a limited number of restricted viewpoints within the grounds of Springvale. Views from Wicker Lane are screened significantly by mature landscaping along the boundaries of the site and the gap between the two buildings is not visible.
- There are functional issues of living in a dwelling where bedrooms are not connected at first floor level. The separation of the bedroom accommodation between the house and the barn means that the home does not function as a single large dwelling, as the master bedroom suite and two additional bedrooms are so detached from the rest of the bedroom accommodation. This in turn is affecting the viability of the house as a single dwelling, as can be seen by the extensive planning history of applications which seek to link the house and barn.
- The principal public benefit of the proposals is the removal of the existing conservatory, and the continued use and habitation of the dwelling.
- The buildings have been substantially and fundamentally changed since their original construction and listing. The description of the buildings within the Committee Report is incorrect in respect of the following: the house doesn't have the porch from the old Bowdon Station; the windows are not 16 pane sash windows; the roof to the barn is not graduated slate; the two buildings are registered for Council Tax separately and have lawful

use as two individual dwellings; the existing link does not contain original, historic fabric.

OBSERVATIONS

It is acknowledged the original buildings have been subject to a number of previous extensions and alterations and that these have altered their character and relationship to each other, however it is considered these have not compromised their character to an extent that the buildings are no longer of special architectural and historic interest. Despite the existing link and other previous extensions, the buildings retain their own individual character and their relationship both in terms of design and siting reflects their historic uses. They remain separately listed for their special architectural and historic interest and as such there is a statutory requirement to have regard to the desirability of preserving the buildings, their setting and their features of special architectural or historic interest. For the reasons set out in the report it is considered the application proposals would result in a loss of distinction between the listed buildings and harm their special architectural character, historic interest and significance. The fact that the proposed extensions may not be prominent from public viewpoints does not mean they would not result in harm to the character buildings.

The comments regarding the bedrooms not being connected at first floor level are noted, however this is the historic situation with the property and there is no overriding public benefit in providing this link. As stated in the report, the property is currently in use as a single dwelling and this has been the case for over 20 years. There is no suggestion this continued use is under threat in any way if a link extension isn't approved; therefore there is no overriding reason why a first floor link is essential for this use to continue.

The comments made regarding the description of the buildings are noted although these would need further investigation to confirm what is correct. It is considered however, that clarification on these elements of the buildings does not affect whether or not the proposed extensions and alterations are acceptable.

It is considered that the further analysis provided by the agent, taken together with the originally submitted Heritage Statement, satisfy the requirement of the NPPF (paragraph 128) for an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected and for the level of detail to be proportionate to the assets' importance and sufficient to understand the potential impact. As such it is considered that refusal reason 2 as set out in the recommendation for both applications should be removed.

RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSE for reason 1 as set out in the report and remove refusal reason 2.

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The original proposal to extend the school was for a two storey extension on the site of the former canteen/existing car park. However the extent of this led to concerns over the proximity of this scheme to the neighbouring dwelling to the west and so the footprint of the building was reduced by adding a third storey to a section of the south elevation.

Altering sections of the existing school to provide another storey was considered but structurally this would have meant rebuilding it from scratch and considerably compromising the character of the existing building. It would also have prevented keeping the school live during construction and resulted in a temporary school having to be built.

The existing school is on three different levels on a sloping site with the requirement for the school as a whole to provide level access. This dictated the ground floor level as the intermediate of the three and on this basis it is considered that the impact from the Taylor Road frontage will be minimal. The traditional materials (brick to match existing and clay roof tiles) will provide coherence to the scheme and, while there is a three storey element, the roof pitch has been taken down to 25 degrees allowing the massing to sit comfortably with the existing school and other elements of the extension.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

Add the following conditions:

18. Contaminated Land Report
19. Submission of Crime Prevention Plan

**HELEN JONES
CORPORATE DIRECTOR
ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE**

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT:
Rob Haslam, Head of Planning Services
Planning Department, 1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford,
M32 0TH
Telephone 0161 912 3149**