

AGENDA ITEM 3

PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT CONTROL) COMMITTEE – 12th November 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 RECOMMENDATION	For REC.
<u>84587</u>	19 Fraser Avenue, Sale, M33 2TF	Sale Moor	1		
<u>84668</u>	Holy Cross Church, Park Road, Timperley, WA15 6QG	Timperley	6		
<u>85022</u>	Land To The North of Station Road, Stretford	Gorse Hill	17		✓
<u>85302</u>	King George, Moss Lane, Hale, WA15 8BA	Hale Central	30		
<u>85822</u>	Development Site, Pomona Strand, Old Trafford	Clifford	37	✓✓	✓✓
<u>85960</u>	Land North West of the junction of St Margarets Road & Groby Road, Altrincham	Bowdon	88	✓	
<u>85971</u>	1-14 Field Walk & Land between rear of 1-4 Field Walk & Playground Clarke Crescent, Hale	Hale Barns	101		
<u>86031</u>	43 - 49 Humphrey Road, Old Trafford, M16 9DD	Longford	108	✓	✓
<u>86034</u>	Fairbairn House, 21 - 25 Ashton Lane, Sale, M33 6WP	Ashton on Mersey	127		

<u>86090</u>	2 Deansgate Lane, Timperley WA15 6SB	Broadheath	136		
<u>86139</u>	24 Wood Lane, Timperley, WA15 7PS	Hale Barns	150	✓	
<u>86196</u>	Land at Cross Street, Sale M33 7AQ	Ashton on Mersey	157		✓
<u>86288</u>	Acre Hall Primary School, Irlam Road, Flixton, M41 6NA	Davyhulme West	173		
<u>86349</u>	Coach House, 5 Sandiway Road, Sale, M33 5AJ	Ashton on Mersey	180		
<u>86361</u>	105 Winstanley Road, Sale, M33 2AT	Priory	185	✓	✓
<u>86382</u>	Bickham House, Green Walk, Bowdon, WA14 2SN	Bowdon	197	✓	
<u>86460</u>	Former Bayer Site, off Manchester Road, West Timperley	Broadheath	203		✓
<u>86507</u>	Land to the rear of 431 - 433 Northenden Road, Sale, M33	Sale Moor	225	✓	
<u>86535</u>	Oakfield Court, 44, 44A, 46 & 48 Crofts Bank Road, Urmston	Urmston	236		
<u>86690</u>	318 Washway Road, Sale, M33 4RT	St Mary's	246		✓

PART 1

Page 6 84668/HHA/15: Holy Cross Church, Park Road, Timperley

OBSERVATIONS

Please delete Para.5 from the above committee report and replace with the following:

The application site is not located within either the Regional Centre or Inner Area and therefore the first priority is not applicable to the determination of this application. However, taking into consideration the second and third bullets of Policy L1.7, it is considered that the site is located in a sustainable location close to public transport links and local schools and other community facilities. It is also considered that the proposal will make a positive contribution towards Strategic Objective SO1 and the Altrincham and Neighbouring Communities Place Objective ALO1, in terms of effectively managing high levels of residential development pressure.

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

Brick samples have been submitted to indicate the colour and texture of the brick sections of the proposed apartments.

Clarification on the external lighting has been provided. This comprises lighting columns throughout the scheme, including the car park under the arches. The applicant has stated the detailed design can be discussed and Condition 23 as recommended in the report will allow for this.

The landowner/joint applicant (Peel Holdings) has provided a further response to the legal agreement referred to in the report (paragraph 36), stating that they are not prepared to enter into a S106 legal agreement.

On the issue of noise from the nearby scrap yard and the railway and tram lines referred to in the report, a further Environmental Noise Survey and Assessment has been submitted.

CONSULTATIONS

Pollution and Licensing – A condition could be attached requiring a scheme of acoustic glazing and ventilation to achieve appropriate internal sound levels within the apartments. Further comments summarised below.

Manchester City Council – The application submitted to Manchester for the car parking beneath the arches is on the agenda for 12 November committee. It is recommended for approval subject to a condition (amongst others) requiring an access and signage strategy to restrict access only to residents and visitors of the proposed development. This is to prevent the access road being used as a general through-road for vehicular traffic, as the transport statement did not assess the impact of traffic, other than that associated with the Trafford application, on the highway network within Manchester. There is also a condition restricting use of the car park to residents of these proposed apartments only.

Salford City Council - Request that the following concerns are considered in the assessment of the application: -

- This is an important site acting as a gateway between the wider Pomona Dock redevelopment area to the west and Salford and Manchester to the north and east. The redevelopment of the site creates an opportunity to improve the environment of the former docks, bring the area back into use and deliver new pedestrian routes and connections across and along the River Irwell/Manchester Ship Canal.
- Salford City Council are not convinced that the design of the development is of sufficient quality or that the scheme layout proposes the most appropriate response to the site and its waterside location. The amendments to the treatment of the elevations proposed since the original submission do not address these concerns. A rethink is needed to deliver a development of greater quality that responds to its location.

- Pedestrian connections between the site and nearby neighbourhoods in Trafford, Salford and Manchester should be considered. Hulme Hall Road adjacent to the railway/tramline viaduct currently has a poor pedestrian environment and does not feel particularly safe after dark. Despite this, the pedestrian route across Woden's footbridge connecting Hulme Hall Road to Ordsall is popular with local residents. The new development should contribute to improving the pedestrian environment around Woden's footbridge with upgraded surfaces, lighting and CCTV.
- The development also presents an opportunity to enhance the waterside footways and the City Council suggests the landscape proposals for the scheme should extend to Woden's footbridge. Consideration should also be given to how the development will connect to Cornbrook metrolink station and the potential future new footbridge across the Bridgewater and Manchester Ship canals to Ordsall.

REPRESENTATIONS

1 further representation received and further responses and information from previous objectors. Many of the points are included in the representations summarised in the report with the addition of the following further comments and information: -

- A copy of all the comments made on the online petition (referred to in the report) have been submitted. The petition header states "*Please halt the plans to build on Pomona until viable social and environmentally sustainable alternatives can be put forward*".
- Officers and members of the Planning Committee are invited to a tour of Pomona by a qualified Ecologist and EcoTourism Guide to see the site they are making a decision about. Lancashire Councillors and officials visited the sites prior to the fracking hearings and Salford Councillors and officials visited the Barton Moss site during the planning application.
- The planning pre-application process with Trafford and Manchester was not a public consultation.
- Open space is in increasingly short supply and more and more studies and discussions prove the need for open green space for urban people. Developers are short-sightedly using this unique space to build as many low quality, ill thought out high density, high volume stacked living units as possible.
- There are other options and better ways to use this space.
- There should be a proper public consultation where ideas may be tabled, shared, discussed and built upon.
- Pomona has the following protected species: Schedule 1 protected RSPCA birds are kingfisher and little ringed plover, Otter and Daubenton's Bat. Protected flora species include the bee orchid.
- There is emerging evidence of roosting bats on Pomona and any development will destroy their habitat. This must be documented and included in an independent wildlife survey.

- There are Little Ringed Plovers nesting on Pomona and accounts of breeding pairs and chicks this year. These are a schedule 1 protected species and a specific species survey should have been completed. Sandmartins are also frequently spotted on Pomona. Other schedule 1 species sighted on the land are Kingfishers. Any decision made without this information is unlawful and would be subject to challenge through the courts in the form of a judicial review.
- Water voles, hedgehogs and other protected animals are often seen here.
- There must be an intensive and impartial third party wildlife review done on the site before any planning permission is granted. This must be done at an appropriate time of year to ensure the presence of said species. Various ecologists have visited the site and would be available for further comment.
- This is a rare and privileged opportunity for a shining example of real sustainable development and should not be wasted on a cheap and all round unappealing environmentally and socially ignorant one.
- S06 of the Trafford Core Strategy could be addressed by introducing passenger traffic on the waterways. Reducing available access to this space will significantly impact the desire and ability of many people to cycle from one side to the other, traffic is dangerous and cycling in the city is not safe.
- The proposal will not provide sufficient affordable housing to meet local need and to comply with policy L2.3.
- Concern that money earmarked for the Manchester Devolution plan is being given to a private developer for this project rather than projects that would benefit the entire city. A press article suggests that £10.3 million has been given from the GMCA. Surely the money should only be announced after the Planning Committee has voted?
- The Manchester Ship Canal World Heritage Group and North England Eco Tourism have unveiled alternative plans for Pomona comprising a new vision for the area as an Ecology Centre, An Eden Project for the North.
- The Save Pomona Gathering attracted more than 100 people.
- Pomona is the perfect opportunity for the science, business and political community to work together towards an Eden Project North and the broader aims of the Manchester Ship Canal obtaining World Heritage Status.
- Pomona and the wildlife of the site has become such a national issue it is featured in BBC Wildlife magazine.
- An official Pomona Bird List of species recorded on the site has been submitted (100 species have been recorded).
- Further information highlighting the importance of the site for Sandmartins has been submitted.

OBSERVATIONS

STRATEGIC LOCATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS

As summarised within the report, Policy SL1 of the Core Strategy sets out a number of specific requirements for the future development of Pomona Island. These include (amongst others) the provision of suitable pedestrian and cycle links, provision of a new informal recreation facility, improvements to the local highway network and public transport infrastructure and provision of ancillary community facilities. With regards to the open space requirement the policy requires “*The provision of a new informal recreation facility, centred around the canal basin*” and also states the Location can deliver “*A substantial new area of open space for informal recreation*”.

The Council was concerned that, in considering this application without either an outline application or masterplan in place, the application should not compromise the ability of the site to deliver the infrastructure and other requirements which are set out in paragraphs 2 and 3 across the strategic development site as a whole. In discussion with the landowner it had been proposed that they would offer an agreement which would “*...clearly cover open space, quantum of development, traffic impact assessment, etc.....*”

Reference to this proposed agreement was made in paragraph 36 of the report in the context of concerns about the delivery of the public open space requirements for the site, although the agreement was not intended to be restricted to the public open space requirements alone. However, it has not been possible to reach an agreement on this matter.

Concerns have been raised that by bringing forward this proposal for only part of the site this could result in piecemeal development of the site and the possibility that the site as a whole will not then deliver the infrastructure and other requirements which were set out in the report and are referred to above. Clearly, as individual applications are approved without an outline permission or masterplan in place, it potentially becomes increasingly difficult to be able to deliver a coherent and cohesive plan for the site as a whole. It is also likely to become more difficult to refuse any subsequent full applications which don't themselves make provision for the delivery of the infrastructure and other requirements which are required for the site as a whole.

However, each application must of course be considered on its own merits. This application relates to a comparatively small site relative to the Strategic Location as a whole and sufficient land would remain for the public open space and other requirements to be provided in a future phase, even without the assurance of an outline permission or masterplan at this stage.

It is also acknowledged that this proposal would both deliver much needed housing in the short-term and has been approved to benefit from the GM Housing Investment fund. These considerations are relevant taking into account the Council's current housing land supply. The Council does not, at present, have a five year supply of immediately available housing. Given the lack of a demonstrable five year supply, the proposal should be considered in light of paragraph 49 of NPPF. Paragraph 49 states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. In this instance, NPPF paragraph 14 indicates that for decision-

making, the presumption in favour of sustainable development means: “*granting permission unless:*

- *any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole; or*
- *specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted (as explained by example in footnote 9 of the NPPF).*

With regards to the issue of precedent, the Council maintains the ability to consider future applications on their merits and to ensure they would not compromise the delivery of the infrastructure and other requirements of policy as set out in the report. If individual applications are considered premature because there isn't an outline permission or masterplan in place to show how delivery of the requirements of SL1 can be achieved, then future applications could be refused on the grounds of prematurity.

For these reasons it is considered that the Council would not be able to require that an outline approval or masterplan should be in place as a pre requisite for the determination of this application. This also means that arguments that the application is on that basis premature should therefore be rejected. Approving this scheme would not necessarily compromise the ability to deliver the requirements of SL1 across the wider site through subsequent applications.

NOISE FROM SCRAP YARD AND RAILWAY/TRAM LINE

The Environmental Noise Survey and Assessment recommends suitable mitigation in the form of a glazing configuration to allow for all the properties to achieve the relevant internal noise criteria. It is also intended to install mechanical vent systems to all apartments. The Assessment has also referred to the likelihood that the scrap yard will be removed with vacant possession before occupation of the proposed apartments. In respect of this scenario however, whilst there is a clear intention for the Cornbrook area to be redeveloped and this is likely to involve relocation of the scrap yard, there is no planning permission or confirmed timescales at this stage and as such this potential scenario cannot be given weight.

The Pollution and Licensing Section has advised that it is feasible that a scheme of acoustic glazing and ventilation can achieve appropriate internal sound levels within apartments even with the presence of the scrap yard. The scheme would need to include high specification glazing to the facades facing the scrap yard, other facades where windows have a line of sight to the scrap yard and mechanical ventilation (heat recovery). This would have to be agreed by way of condition. There is concern that, for example, the opening of balcony doors could nullify the benefit of the sound insulation scheme. Someone insisting on opening doors or windows and not using the mechanical ventilation could complain of excessive noise within the apartments, therefore any scheme to be submitted by condition should also include details of measures that could be put in place to avoid this occurring (unless the scrap yard has been relocated by the time development commences).

The operating times of the scrap yard (as stated in the Environmental Noise Assessment) are 0800-1700 Monday to Friday, 0800-1300 Saturday and closed Sunday and therefore outside of the times or days when future residents could reasonably expect not be disturbed by noise.

CAR PARKING

Manchester City Council's comments are noted and the conditions recommended would apply to the development in the event both applications are approved. Condition 9 as recommended in the report deals with the requirement for the car parking in Manchester to be provided prior to any permission being commenced and the conditions recommended by Manchester would restrict the access and parking to residents and visitors of the development only.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT

Amend condition 22 to require a scheme of acoustic glazing and ventilation that achieves appropriate internal sound levels within the apartments and other mitigation measures as appropriate to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of development.

Additional condition: Archaeological mitigation

Page 88 85960/FUL/15: Land North West of the junction of St Margarets Road & Groby Road, Altrincham

SPEAKER(S)

AGAINST:

**Paul Carr
(Agent)**

FOR:

PROPOSAL

The proposal differs from the earlier approved scheme in the following respects:

1. The site entrance has been reduced in width with the removal of a visibility splay
2. Car parking has been set out ground level rather than underground reducing the level of engineering required.
3. The foot print of the building has been reduced.
4. Includes a stone frontage with a stone colonnade sitting forward of the face of the dwelling

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

82686/FULL/2014 – Erection of detached dwelling and formation of vehicular access to Groby Road. Refused 6/1/15 for the following reasons:-

1. The access would by reason of the loss of a section of wall, bank and soft landscaping would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Devisdale Conservation Area, and fail to better reveal the significance of the heritage asset. Furthermore the applicant has failed to demonstrate how the development will complement and enhance the existing features of historic significance including their wider setting and how the development will preserve or enhance the Conservation Area in the light of relevant Supplementary Planning Documents. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies L7, R1, R2 and R3 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's approved Planning Guidelines: 'The Downs, The Devisdale, Bowdon and Ashley Heath Conservation Areas, and to relevant national policies as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed gates, by virtue of their design and siting form an incongruous feature within the street scene and are detrimental to the character and appearance of the Devisdale Conservation Area, and fail to better reveal the significance of the heritage asset. As such, the proposal is contrary to policies L7 and R1 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's approved Planning Guidelines 'The Downs, The Devisdale, Bowdon and Ashley Heath Conservation Areas' and to relevant national policies as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
3. The proposed dwelling, by reason of its siting, scale, massing, design, proximity to site boundaries, and loss of spaciousness and historic landscaping, would result in a cramped form of development that would harm the spacious character of the area. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies L1.10, L2, L7 and R1 of the Trafford Core Strategy, Proposal ENV21 of the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan and the Council's approved Planning Guidelines 'New Residential Development' and Guidelines for the Devisdale Conservation Area and advice contained within the NPPF.
4. The proposed dwelling by virtue of its design and external appearance and level of hardsurfacing proposed would form an incongruous and alien feature within the street scene and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or the appearance of the Devisdale Conservation Area. As such it is contrary to policies L7, L1.10 and R1 of the Trafford Core Strategy Proposal ENV21, of the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan and the Council's approved Planning Guidelines 'New Residential Development' and Guidelines for the Devisdale Conservation Area and advice contained within the NPPF.
5. The applicant has failed to demonstrate how the development would satisfy the tests set out at L1.7-L1.9 of the Trafford Core Strategy in particular how the development of the land will not compromise the Council's achievement of its brownfield land target over the Plan period.

OBSERVATIONS

In order to better reflect the Council's position on the principle of development:-

Delete paragraphs 1 – 7 inclusive and replace with the following:-

Principle of the Development

1. There are two main issues to be addressed in respect of the principle of this development. Firstly whether the development of this garden land is in accordance with Policies in respect of new housing development and secondly whether the proposal preserves or enhances the Conservation Area and better reveals the significance of a designated heritage asset.
2. As part of this proposal is on garden land, which is classified as greenfield land both in the Core Strategy and NPPF, it will need to be considered in the light of Policies L1.7- L1.10 of the Trafford Core Strategy.
3. Specifically, Policy L1.7 sets an indicative target of 80% of new housing provision to be built on brownfield land. In order to achieve this, the Council will release previously developed land and sustainable urban area green-field land in the following order of priority:
 - a. Firstly land within the Regional Centre and Inner Areas;
 - b. Secondly, land that can be shown to contribute significantly to the achievement of the regeneration priorities set out in Policy L3 and/or strengthen and support Trafford's 4 town centres; and
 - c. Thirdly land that can be shown to be of benefit to the achievement of the wider plan objectives set out in Chapters 4 and 5 of the Core Strategy. (Strategic Objectives and Place Objectives).
4. The first priority cannot relate to this proposal because the site does not sit within either the Regional Centre or Inner Area. Therefore the application will need to be considered against the second and third points of Policy L1.7.
5. Taking into account the location of the development site, outside of the boundary of Altrincham Town Centre, it is considered that the development will not make a significant positive contribution towards strengthening and supporting Altrincham Town Centre. Therefore, it must be considered against the third point of Policy L1.7.
6. The applicant has not submitted a statement in relation to Policy L1.7, in particular setting out how the proposal would conform with the Core Strategy Strategic and Place Objectives. That said, the Council cannot at present demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land and as such the proposal should be considered in light of paragraph 49 of NPPF. Paragraph 49 states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
7. Policy L1.10 states that "Where development proposals would involve the use of domestic gardens, due regard will need to be paid to local character, environment, amenity and conservation considerations." The site is within the Devisdale Conservation Area and detailed information about the character of the area and conservation considerations is to be found in the Planning Guidelines for The Downs, The Devisdale,

Bowdon and Ashley Heath Conservation Areas which are currently being updated with the draft Devisdale Conservation Area Appraisal. It is concluded that the proposed development is in conflict with Policy L1.10 for reasons set out below and as such the proposal does not represent sustainable development.

CONCLUSION

It is considered that the revised application for a new dwelling has sufficiently reduced the size of the building such that it can no longer fully justify being refused on the grounds of a “cramped form of development” and therefore it is not proposed to repeat reason 3 from the refusal of application 82686/FULL/2014.

The recommended reasons for refusal no longer include one specifically relating to the gates as details are not provided as part of this application and if the application were to be approved this matter could be dealt with by way of condition.

In other respects the applicant has not addressed the principle of a loss of a section of wall, banking and soft landscaping or sufficiently addressed the concerns regarding design and external appearance of the proposed dwelling.

RECOMMENDATION

Delete reason 3 and replace with the following:-

3. The applicant has not demonstrated how the development would satisfy the tests set out at L1.7-L1.10 of the Trafford Core Strategy and paragraph 49 of NPPF. It is considered that the development does not constitute sustainable development and as such is contrary to the Trafford Core Strategy and NPPF.

Page 108 86031/FUL/15: 43 - 49 Humphrey Road, Old Trafford

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	Christine Cresser (Neighbour)
	FOR:	Michael Stewart (Agent)

Page 127 86034/FUL/15: Fairbairn House, 21 - 25 Ashton Lane, Sale

detrimental impact upon the residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring residential occupants.

RECOMMENDATION

Please delete Condition 13 on original report and replace with the following:

13. The commercial premises on the ground floor of the building hereby approved shall not be open for customers outside the following hours: -

0700 - 2300 hours, Mondays – Sundays. If a commercial unit is brought into use operating as a gym (Use Class D2) this shall be open for customers Mondays - Sundays 24 hours a day, subject to submission of a noise impact assessment to include noise mitigation measures being submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full prior to commencement of the use of development as a gym.

Please note this is an additional condition to those previously detailed in the original report:

17. Management Plan for gym (Use Class D2) in commercial unit at ground floor level

Page 173 86288/VAR/15: Acre Hall Primary School, Irlam Road, Flixton

PROPOSAL

Additional information has been submitted to address condition 14 on Planning Approval 81878/FULL/2013 requiring the submission of a scheme for cycle, motor cycle and scooter storage.

Additional information has also been provided to show the provision of bollards to ensure that vehicles do not park in gaps in parking spaces in front of the entrance to the hall and the pedestrian route to the main entrance, thereby obstructing pedestrian routes and possibly a fire exit from the hall.

CONSULTATIONS

The LHA has advised that the revised plans address the concerns which they raised in their earlier comments.

OBSERVATIONS

It is considered that the cycle/motor cycle and scooter shelters are considered acceptable however there is no indication on the submitted site plan where the scooter facilities are to be provided.

RECOMMENDATION

It is considered that in the light of the LHA's further comments the proposed condition 13 requiring the submission of cycle, motorcycle and scooter storage details can be amended to require details as to where the scooter storage is to be provided and to require the implementation of the details and Condition 2 Compliance with approved plans can include reference to the amended Site Plan drawing 204 Revision B.

Page 185 86361/FUL/15: 105 Winstanley Road, Sale

SPEAKER(S)	AGAINST:	Simon Kennedy (Neighbour)
	FOR:	Benjamin Maguire (Agent)

REPRESENTATIONS

Since the original report to Committee was published four additional letters of representation has been received. The following issues have been raised –

- The proposed shop is out of keeping with the residential area where it is located
- There is no need for an additional retail unit in this area as residents are already catered for by other units in the area. Many of the retail units within walking distance are run down and have off putting shop fronts that add nothing to the neighbourhood.
- Neighbouring residents already have problems entering and exiting their properties due to vehicles parking on the double yellow lines on Winstanley Road – this proposal will exacerbate problems with on street parking and congestion due to the lack of on-site parking provision.
- The junction of Dane Road and Winstanley Road is busy with cars turning the corner rather quickly and consequently the junction can be difficult to cross on foot, giving rise to safety concerns.
- The proposal will result in an increase in litter due to the unit selling drinks and snacks.
- The proposed retail unit could become a congregating place for groups of youths – particularly if the premises obtained a license to sell alcohol in the future.
- The proposal will result in neighbouring residents being exposed to an increase in the levels of noise and disturbance they are exposed to.
- The hours of operation are too long – the premises should not be allowed to open until 9pm.
- A previous application to use the property as a A1 retail store was refused in June 2006 (application ref H/65085).

Manchester Strategic Framework has been advanced. The emerging Land Allocations identifies the site for new residential development. However the identification of the site for residential development should be regarded as a material consideration, albeit of limited weight. The site is currently unallocated with the UDP Proposals map and has historically been used for industrial/storage/office related use and has been long term vacant. The proposal is considered to be acceptable for its end use of residential with regards the current status of the site and this is outlined in the main section of the officers report to committee (Principle of Development Para. 1 – 11).

Loss of Employment Land – This particular element is addressed at para.8 of the officers report to committee.

Highways - The LHA has stipulated that the access road will need to be brought up to adoptable standard, including the provision of street lighting, and be adopted by the LHA. This is reflected in the applicant's submission.

Visibility at the existing junction of Etchells Road is acceptable and the road traffic collision records do not suggest any safety concerns at this location. The LHA had concerns relating to visibility at the junction of Etchells Road with the proposed site access over Timperley Brook but is satisfied that adequate visibility is provided within the highway that is proposed to be adopted. The HOW representation also stated that the applicant had no control over visibility splays at the junction of the new bridge access over land that was not within the applicants ownership. The applicant has provided original details of a S106 originally between Redrow Developments and the Council (Jan 2000), this information clarifies the applicant's rights over the land around the access road junction. It is understood Bradley Investments acquired the land from Redrow in December 2001 and were subject to the provisions of the S106.

The LHA is satisfied with the proposed trip generation undertaken using trips and presented in table 5.1 on page 14 of the Transport Statement which accompanied the application. This predicts a low number of vehicle trips to and from the proposed development during the weekday morning and evening peak periods. In general these traffic movements will be in the opposite direction to the traffic travelling to and from the nearby business uses i.e. in towards the businesses and out from the proposed residential in the morning peak (21 vehicle departures and 7 vehicle arrivals predicted, associated with the proposed residential development), and in the evening peak (9 vehicle departures and 19 vehicle arrivals predicted, associated with the proposed residential development).

Whilst these trips will be in addition to the traffic already using the road network in the immediate vicinity of the site, the LHA does not consider the additional traffic to be of sufficient volume to affect the safety and operation of the network, particularly at the junctions of Etchells Road with Stamford Brook Road and Stamford Brook Road with Manchester Road (A56) and therefore did not request that the operation of these junction be modelled.

In relation to the parking provision, the LHA considers that the level of parking provision provided for the residential development is acceptable. Car parking provision is strictly in accordance with the maximum standards for the houses and car parking provision for the apartments is only marginally below the maximum standards, but provides a minimum of one per apartment with further tandem parking which must be allocated to the two bedroom apartments. The maximum standards indicate for this development a maximum number of 125 car parking spaces should be provided. The applicant is proposing 118, which overall is only 7 below this maximum standard.

Density and Dwelling Mix - The representation from HOW states that the proposal represents a density of circa 45 units per hectare, compared to the adjacent Redrow site which equates 30 units per hectare and therefore the site proposes a greater density of development than the adjacent residential site. Advice within the Councils New Residential Development SPG identifies that developments of between 30 to 50 dwellings will be encouraged. The advice also indicates that greater intensity of development will be sought around locations with good public transport infrastructure. The application site would be considered to be located in a sustainable location with regards proximity to public transport and the density of development reflects advice within the Councils adopted guidelines. The representation also makes reference to the site being located in an area of high risk of flooding, this issue is covered within the officers main report to Planning Committee at paragraphs 9-11.

The provision of one bedroom accommodation is addressed within the officer's report to committee paragraphs 4 – 6.

Page 225 86507/FUL/15: Land to the rear of 431 - 433 Northenden Road, Sale

**SPEAKER(S) AGAINST: Debi Piper
(Neighbour)**

FOR:

REPRESENTATIONS

5 further letters have been received objecting to the amended plans for the proposed development for reasons set out in the Committee report.

In addition, objections on the grounds that:-

- The Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015 relate to the construction process with regard to health and safety and eliminating risk. Risk can be eliminated by construction vehicles accessing/egressing the site only via Farmers close. Construction vehicles would be disruptive and detrimental to the amenity of no.431 (and potentially damage the drains as previously happened) if they are allowed to use the access to the side of no.431. If planning permission is

granted, request a condition is attached requiring all construction vehicles to access the site via Farmers Close. (From the owner-occupiers of no.431);

- Access only from Farmers Close, alternatively access exclusively via Northenden Road – no dual access;
- Any future developer must be aware that no.431 has rights of access along the side access. A gate is required that allows trailers to access the rear of no.431 not just pedestrians;
- What sort of trees would be planted and how would these be managed to avoid loss of light?
- A high fence (3m) with no gates across the entire width of the properties is required to prevent any access via Northenden Road and to ensure safety and security.

Councillor Freeman

Reiterates concerns regarding the pedestrian access to the site via Northenden Road. Lockable gates will not deter criminals a 3m high fence is required.

APPLICANTS SUBMISSION

The proposed revised scheme has the support of Greater Manchester Police – Secure by Design. The suggestion of a 3m high fence would be inappropriate for this residential setting.

CONDITIONS

Additional condition requiring all construction vehicles to access the site via Farmers Close and not via the side access to no.431 Northenden Road. (The agent is in agreement to this).

Page 236 86535/VAR/15: Oakfield Court, 44, 44A, 46 & 48 Crofts Bank Road, Urmston

REPRESENTATIONS

The occupants of 2 Ellaston Drive have sent in a further representation reiterating objections previously reported on the officers report before Planning Committee. In addition the objection requests that the rear balcony area to be used only for access be amended to make it less likely to be used as an area to be used for sitting out. The representation also requests that the floor to ceiling hallway window on the rear elevation have obscured glazing to restrict light spillage. The neighbour had also requested that committee members visit the site, this request was supported by Councillor Procter who circulated an e-mail to committee members requesting they visit the site in advance of the committee meeting.

Additional points raised by the neighbour:-

- The building is oppressive

- The properties on Ellaston Drive were built before Trafford Councils supplementary planning guidance privacy distances were introduced.
- The balconies would never have been approved on the original scheme

OBSERVATIONS

IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

In response to the additional points raised by the neighbour at 2 Ellaston Drive; the proposed condition attached (No.17) prevents any use of the rear facing balcony area on the eastern elevation being used for any other purpose apart from maintenance and emergency access, this condition is sufficient to control this use.

Obscure glazing to the rear facing hallway window cannot be justified as this is a measure normally used to prevent undue overlooking. The window which is not of an excessive size is partially screened to the north and northeast side as it is recessed back, it is not considered that the light from this window causes a level of nuisance to properties beyond the eastern boundary to justify a refusal given the distance retained between buildings and the size of the opening.

Page 246 86690/HHA/15: 318 Washway Road, Sale

SPEAKER(S)

AGAINST:

FOR:

**Elaine Goodeve
(For Applicant)**

**HELEN JONES, DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND
CORPORATE DIRECTOR, ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND
INFRASTRUCTURE**

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT:

**David Pearson, Interim Head of Planning and Development
Planning Department, 1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford,
M32 0TH
Telephone 0161 912 3149**