

AGENDA ITEM 3

PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT CONTROL) COMMITTEE – 13th August 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
84747	166 Ashley Road, Hale, WA15 9SF	Hale Central	1	✓	
85087	Former Creamline Dairies, 181 Moorside Road, Flixton, M41 5SJ	Flixton	12	✓	
85296	Asda, Atlantic Street, Altrincham	Broadheath	30		✓
85435	Petrol Station & land adjacent to 499 Chester Road, Old Trafford	Clifford	40		
85511	18 Primrose Cottages, Brickkiln Row, Bowdon, WA14 3EL	Bowdon	56	✓	✓
85655	Bowdon Church of England Primary School, Grange Road, Bowdon, WA14 3EX	Bowdon	64		
85781	Lancashire County Cricket Club, Brian Statham Way, Old Trafford, M16 0PX	Longford	74		

Page 1 84747/FUL/15: 166 Ashley Road, Hale

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Andrew Morgan
(Neighbour)**

FOR:

CONSULTATIONS

Further comments of clarification in response to queries that have been raised have been received as follows:-

Pollution, Housing and Licensing

Noise Control

The sound level readings were taken at the nearest residential property. Whilst it is acknowledged that this is not the nearest property it is the most sensitive in terms of night time noise from the extract system causing a sleep disturbance to the residents.

The timings of the noise reading were completely appropriate. Where background noise levels are taken at a quiet times this leads to a stricter noise criteria being imposed on the development.

As a night time noise level has been imposed for the development it is considered that an appropriate level has been set to protect neighbours of the restaurant.

Page 12 85087/FUL/15: Former Creamline Dairies, 181 Moorside Road, Flixton

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Christine Gough
(Neighbour)**

FOR:

Page 30 85296/VAR/15: Asda, Atlantic Street, Altrincham

SPEAKER(S) AGAINST:

**FOR: Rebecca Dennis
(Agent)**

RECOMMENDATION

Condition 1 detailed within the committee report has been removed, as the scheme has now been implemented. The list of conditions has been amended to reflect this change.

Page 56 85511/HHA/15: 18 Primrose Cottages, Brickkiln Row, Bowdon

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	Libby Hine (Neighbour)
	FOR:	George Tsiantar (Agent)

REPRESENTATIONS

Altrincham and Bowdon Civic Society - Objects on the following grounds:-

- “Soapy Town” is very important historically as an example of the rich on top of the hill being serviced by the poor at the bottom.
- Concerns raised regarding the lack of a Conservation Officer threatening Trafford’s heritage.

Bowdon Downs Resident’s Association - Objects on the following grounds:-

- The proposal would significantly alter the character of these heritage assets consisting of not only the terraced gardens, but also the expanse of gardens behind them, designed for the drying of washed clothes, taken in by historic residents on a large scale.
- There is a case for Primrose Cottages to be Listed
- Raises concerns that the lack of a Trafford Conservation Officer for both heritage assets within Conservation Area and for those outside of them means that they are put at unnecessary risk.
- The extension appears to be un-neighbourly

WYG Planning & Environment - Has submitted objections on behalf of neighbours:-

- 19th Century cottages with open aspect to south and whose elevation has remained relatively unaltered with the exception of modest sunroom extensions and terraces – these additions do not detract from pleasant communal feel
- Notes that current application is a re-submission of 85094/PAH/15 for a similar rear extension that was refused and is a material consideration.
- Accepts that the buildings are not listed and not within the Conservation Area. Acknowledge that these dwellings may not necessarily fulfill the

criteria for inclusion in the local list. However, this does not mean that these buildings do not have heritage value and that the unique characteristics of the properties such as the open plan gardens and modern size of the dwellings should not be preserved through sensitive new development.

- Modern materials and form contrast with existing design and character
- The proposals do not make the best of opportunities to improve the character and quality of the area
- The position and size of the extension means that this open aspect would be lost for the entire terrace and acutely for No's 16 and 20 Primrose Terrace.
- Questions why guidance at paragraph 2.16 (SPD4) has not been referenced as this specifically discourages the siting of a tall wall in close proximity to a boundary and the extension would lead to an uncomfortable sense of enclosure which paragraph 2.17.1 (SPD4) guards against.
- The extension would breach the 45 degree code for the only habitable room window on the southern elevation of the property resulting in a significant loss of light and particularly evening sun which would have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of the existing occupants of no.20.
- The extension would fail to respect the Council's standards (paragraph 3.4.2 SPD4) regarding rear projections and would be un-neighbourly.
- Clients do not object to an extension in principle, but this extension is too large which has resulted in an unsympathetic and awkward design which would detract from the character of the terrace.
- If allowed this extension would set a dangerous precedent which would destroy the character of the terrace.

CONSULTATIONS

LHA: No objections

OBSERVATIONS

The Council has assessed the application site and its heritage contribution within the original Committee Report.

The proposed development would be sited on a land level that has been measured as being approximately 0.6m lower than the internal floor level of the rear habitable rooms of No's 16 and 20 and therefore the proposed eaves level would be approximately 1.8m higher when viewed from the southern habitable room of No's 16 and 20 with a maximum external roof height similar to both neighbouring extensions. The eaves height of the extension when measured from an adjoining terrace would be approximately 2.2m, with the roof increasing in height moving away from the common boundary at the furthest point from the main rear elevation. This proposed development is considered to be similar in size, scale and massing of other standard single storey rear extensions and therefore is not considered to result in an unduly dominant or visually intrusive

development that would cause detrimental harm to the amenity of adjacent occupants; it is further considered that the development would not impact adversely on the character of the wider southern elevation of Primrose Cottages.

The maximum projection of 4.275m would be 2.8m further than the single storey rear projections of both No's 16 and 20 Primrose Cottages. The Council's adopted SPD 4 on House Extensions at section 3.4 allows for single storey extensions to project 3 metres and also allows for account to be taken of neighbours extensions. The proposal is in accordance with these guidelines in respect of impact on neighbouring properties as both adjacent properties have their own rear extensions.

There has been concern raised regarding the development and that it would breach the 45 degree code (based on Building Research Establishment – BRE – document "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A guide to good practice (2011)") on the southern elevation of the property resulting in a significant loss of light and particularly evening sun and the adverse impact it would have upon the existing occupants of no.20. The rear habitable room of that property is the entire width of the dwelling (4.4m) and therefore the central position of the habitable room would be approximately 2.2m from the common boundary. A horizontal 45 degree line from this central position would suggest that the last 0.7 m of the extension would breach this code. However, the eaves height being only 1.8m higher than the habitable room's floor level, the increase in height of the gable end moving away from the common boundary and no.20's predominantly glazed rear lounge elevation would all mitigate against any significant harm arising from the proposal. A vertical 45 degree line would not be breached by the proposed extension.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation remains unchanged.

Page 64 85655/FUL/15: Bowdon Church of England Primary School, Grange Road, Bowdon

This application has been withdrawn by the Agent.

Page 74 85781/FUL/15: Lancashire County Cricket Club, Brian Statham Way, Old Trafford

OBSERVATIONS

ACCESS AND CAR PARKING

26. The Cricket Club are still reviewing options that would allow a longer taxi drop-off bay to be provided as part of this scheme. As such a drawing that

details the precise location and size of the drop-off area should be secured by condition.

RECOMMENDATION: MINDED TO GRANT SUBJECT TO A LEGAL AGREEMENT

Add the following condition:

13. Location and dimensions of layby/drop-off area to be submitted to the LPA.

**MRS. HELEN JONES
DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

**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**