

WARD: Longford

100400/OUT/20

DEPARTURE: No

The demolition of existing retail unit and associated structures; erection of buildings for a mix of use including: 333 apartments (use class C3) and communal spaces ancillary to the residential use; flexible space for use classes A1, A3, D1 and/or D2; undercroft car parking; new public realm; and associated engineering works and infrastructure

Former B&Q Site , Great Stone Road, Stretford, M32 0YP

APPLICANT: Accrue (Forum) 1 LLP

AGENT: WSP Indigo

RECOMMENDATION: MINDED TO REFUSE (IN CONTESTING THE APPEAL)

INTRODUCTORY MATTERS

The context of this report is to establish the Council's stance at a forthcoming appeal in respect of application ref. 100400/OUT/20 (following the submission of a non-determination appeal). The submission of this type of appeal has removed the ability of this Council to determine the application. However, there remains a need to define the Council's position to adopt the appeal.

Upon submission of the planning application it was considered by the Officer's that the application was invalid due to the lack of a Financial Viability Assessment as part of the planning application submission. The applicant disputed the need for a Financial Viability Appraisal and the Council subsequently sought legal advice. The Counsel advice received supported the applicant's position on this matter. The application was validated on the 25 June 2020 and back dated to the date at which it was valid in all other respects, the 16 April 2020. As a result of this delay, the target date for the determination of the application was the 16 July 2020. The applicant refused to agree to a requested extension of time.

The applicant's decision to submit a non-determination appeal comes at a time when the application was still in the early stages of consideration and when negotiations were continuing in an attempt to resolve outstanding issues. Moreover, amended/additional information was submitted for the Council's review after the appeal was lodged to the Planning Inspectorate. The effect is that, as reflected in this report, there are some matters on which a solution may be capable of being reached but other matters remain outstanding at this time.

SITE

The application site is vacant, approximately 1 ha in size and is located on Great Stone Road. A single storey retail warehouse unit is located on the site and this unit, formerly occupied by B&Q. Car parking serving this retail unit is located to the front and side of the unit.

The site is rectangular in shape and is bound by Great Stone Road to the south west, the Metrolink to the south east and Lancashire Cricket Club (LCC) to the north east and north west. To the rear of the site (NE) is a single storey building which provides ancillary facilities to LCC and to the side (NW) there is a car park. There is a tree buffer along the south eastern boundary of the site with a number of trees falling within the application site and on adjacent Metrolink land.

The site fronts Great Stone Road which gradually increases in height from 27.15m AOD to 32.69m AOD as it passes the front of the application site and forms a bridge over the Metrolink line. The majority of the site is set at a lower land level than the adjacent public highway and has a site level of between 27.23 m AOD and 27.51m AOD.

To the south-east, south and west of the application site the area is generally residential in character, predominantly characterised by the development of two storey dwellings. To the north and north east of the site, the area is sport and leisure/civic in character, with Trafford College, Stretford Police Station and Trafford Town Hall all being within the wider vicinity of the site.

In terms of scale, development within the immediate vicinity of the site is generally two storeys high, although the height of development does increase within the LCC ground with the spectator stands rising to the equivalent of approximately six storeys in height and the Lancastrian Office Centre which is two and six storeys in height.

PROPOSAL

This outline planning application seeks approval for access, appearance, layout and scale of the development. The only reserved matter is landscaping.

This outline planning application seeks permission for the development of:

- 333 apartments with a mix of 2 x studio, 108 x 1 bed, 190 x 2 bed, 33 x 3 bed units and 133m² ancillary residents amenity space (use class C3 – residential);
- Two flexible commercial units measuring 180m² and 168m². The planning statement explains that these commercial units could be used for the following purposes:
 - Café (use class A3)
 - Convenience retail serving the local residential population (use class A1);
 - Community facility such as ‘drop-in’ health care clinic, hireable meeting space or temporary ‘pop up’ uses (use class D1); and/or
 - Gym and fitness suite serving the local market (use class D2).

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

For the purposes of this application the Development Plan in Trafford comprises:

- The **Trafford Core Strategy**, adopted 25th January 2012; The Trafford Core Strategy is the first of Trafford's Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents to be adopted by the Council; it partially supersedes the Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan (UDP), see Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy.
- The **Revised Trafford Unitary Development Plan** (UDP), adopted 19th June 2006; The majority of the policies contained in the Revised Trafford UDP were saved in either September 2007 or December 2008, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until such time that they are superseded by policies within the (LDF). Appendix 5 of the Trafford Core Strategy provides details as to how the Revised UDP is being replaced by Trafford LDF.

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

SL3 – Lancashire Cricket Club Quarter
 L1 – Land for New Homes
 L2 – Meeting Housing Needs
 L4 – Sustainable Transport and Accessibility
 L5 – Climate Change
 L7 – Design
 L8 – Planning Obligations
 W1 – Economy
 W2 – Town Centres and Retail
 R1 – Historic Environment
 R2 – Natural Environment
 R3 – Green Infrastructure
 R5 – Open Space, Sport and Recreation

PROPOSALS MAP NOTATION

Trafford Inner Area

PRINCIPAL RELEVANT REVISED UDP POLICIES/PROPOSALS

H10 – Priority Regeneration Area – Old Trafford
 S11 – Development Outside Established Centres

OTHER RELEVANT DOCUMENTS

Civic Quarter Area Action Plan (Regulation 18 Draft – February 2020 - The Council is bringing forward a Civic Quarter Area Action Plan (AAP), which was consulted on between 5th February and 9th April 2020. The application site is located within a prominent location in the 'Southern Neighbourhood' of the proposed AAP along with the Lancashire Cricket Club (LCC) ground and the Lancastrian House Office development.

The AAP is at present a consultation draft and therefore can only be afforded limited weight in the determination of this planning application.

Refreshed Stretford Masterplan (2018) – The Refreshed Stretford Masterplan (2018) identifies the proposed development site as being within the UA92 Campus Quarter. The Masterplan states that the intention is for the proposed development site to be incorporated into the wider master planning work being undertaken in this area. Although not a Development Plan Document the Refreshed Stretford Masterplan is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications

GREATER MANCHESTER SPATIAL FRAMEWORK

The Greater Manchester Spatial Framework is a joint Development Plan Document being produced by each of the ten Greater Manchester districts and, once adopted, will be the overarching development plan for all ten districts, setting the framework for individual district local plans. The first consultation draft of the GMSF was published on 31 October 2016, and a further period of consultation on the revised draft ended on 18 March 2019. A Draft Plan will be published for consultation in autumn 2020 before it is submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination. The weight to be given to the GMSF as a material consideration will normally be limited given that it is currently at an early stage of the adoption process. Where it is considered that a different approach should be taken, this will be specifically identified in the report. If the GMSF is not referenced in the report, it is either not relevant, or carries so little weight in this particular case that it can be disregarded.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in 19 February 2019. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

NATIONAL PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE (NPPG)

DCLG published the National Planning Practice Guidance on 6 March 2014, and was updated on 1st October 2019. The NPPG will be referred to as appropriate in the report.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

94974/OUT/18 - Outline application sought for the demolition of existing retail unit and associated structures; erection of building for a mix of uses including: 433 apartments (use class C3) and communal spaces ancillary to the residential use; flexible spaces for use classes A1, A3, B1, D1, and/or D2; undercroft car parking; new public realm; and associated engineering works and infrastructure. Consent is sought for access, appearance, layout and scale with all other matters reserved. Refused, 29.03.2019 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would represent poor design as its height, scale, layout, density, massing and monolithic appearance are inappropriate in its context and would result in a building which would be significantly out of scale

and keeping with its surroundings. This would have a highly detrimental impact on the street scene and the character and quality of the area. This would be contrary to Policies SL3, R3 and L7 of the adopted Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed development would not provide a development plan policy compliant level of planning obligations in relation to affordable housing; spatial green infrastructure and outdoor sports provision; healthcare facilities; and site specific highways improvements to suitably and appropriately mitigate the impacts of the development. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that there is a robust viability case to demonstrate that the scheme could not offer a policy compliant level of obligations. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies SL3, L2, L4, L5, L7 and L8 of the adopted Core Strategy and the Council's adopted Revised Supplementary Planning Document 1 (SPD1) - Planning Obligations and the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The proposed development by virtue of its height, massing, scale and layout would result in a poor level of amenity and unacceptable living standards for future occupiers of the development, by virtue of inadequate daylight, sunlight and outlook in both apartments and amenity areas. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies SL3, L3 and L7 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. The proposed development by virtue of its height, massing, scale and layout would result in harm to the amenity of existing residential properties on Great Stone Road and Trent Bridge Walk by virtue of noticeable reductions in the amount of daylight and sunlight that they receive, and would also have an overbearing impact on these properties and other residential properties in the wider 'Gorses' area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies SL3, L3 and L7 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
5. The applicant has failed to demonstrate, through the submission of sufficient information, that the adverse wind related impacts of the development can be adequately mitigated. Based on the information before the Council the proposal would result in an unacceptably windy environment for future occupiers of the development, to the detriment of their amenity and which would not provide acceptable living conditions, contrary to Policy SL3, L3 and L7 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
6. The proposed development would have a harmful impact on the setting of Trafford Town Hall equating to 'less than substantial' harm in National Planning Policy Framework terms. The benefits of the scheme are not considered to outweigh the identified harm to a designated heritage asset. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies SL3, L3 and R1 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
7. The applicant has failed to provide requested information to allow an informed assessment to be made of the impact of the proposed development on the setting and therefore significance of Longford Park Conservation Area, a designated heritage asset. The applicant has therefore failed to demonstrate

the development would not harm the significance of the designated heritage asset. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy R1 and Place Objective STO22 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

8. The proposed development would have a dominating and adverse impact on Lancashire Cricket Club (LCC) as well as its setting and cultural character and identity. LCC is a non-designated heritage asset and internationally significant visitor attraction, cultural and tourism venue. The scale of the harm and the significance of the asset, as well as the potential impact on the visitor experience are considered to be sufficient to weigh strongly against the proposals. The development is therefore contrary to Policies SL3, R1 and R6 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
9. No dedicated car parking is provided for the 1,181sq metres of retail and / or commercial floorspace proposed and the applicant has not demonstrated that reasonable and enforceable planning conditions could be used to limit the use of this floorspace to occupants of the proposed development. Failure to provide adequate car parking provision for these uses would result in ad-hoc on street parking to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to Policy L4 of the adopted Core Strategy, ppSPD3: Parking Standards and Design and the National Planning Policy Framework.

91337/DEM/17 - Demolition of all buildings including vacant unit. (Consultation under Schedule 2, Part 11 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. Prior Approval Approved 08.06.2017.

H27952 – Removal of condition no 3 (attached to planning permission H/4717) to allow Sunday trading (0900 – 1800). Allowed at appeal 04.10.1989.

H04717 – Change of use from entertainment centre to DIY homes & garden centre for supply to the public and trade of home and garden maintenance and improvement materials. Approved 15.11.1978.

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

The applicant has submitted the following information in support of this planning application:

- Affordable Housing Statement
- Air Quality Assessment and Air Quality Note
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment
- Carbon Budget Statement
- Crime Impact Statement
- Daylight and Sunlight Assessment
- Design and Access Statement
- Draft Heads of Terms
- Ecological Assessment
- Environmental Risk Assessment

- Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy
- Heritage Statement
- Landscape Design Statement
- Landscape and Townscape Visual Impact Assessment
- Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment
- Planning Statement (including Retail Sequential Test)
- Statement of Community Engagement
- Transport Assessment
- Travel Plan
- Wind Microclimate Report

CONSULTATIONS

Cadent Gas – no objection, it is highly likely that there are gas services and associated apparatus in the vicinity.

Clinical Commissioning Group – no objection and no contribution required towards health services.

Electricity North West – the proposed development is adjacent to or may affect Electricity North West's operational land or electricity distribution assets.

Environment Agency – no objection in principle, however the EA advise that the site appears to have been the subject of past industrial activity which poses a medium risk of pollution to controlled waters. The EA also advise that reference is made to the EA's 'Guiding Principles for Land Contamination' on managing risks to the water environment and consultation with Pollution and Licensing on generic aspects of land contamination.

Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service (GMAAS) – no comments to make on this development.

Greater Manchester Cycling Campaign - no response received.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) – no objection subject to the imposition of conditions in accordance with the recommendations outlined in section 5 of the submitted report relating to: native tree planting within the landscaping scheme; external lighting design; pre-commencement survey of the site for badgers and the adjacent area; bird breeding and vegetation clearance; installation of bird boxes; and, biodiversity enhancements.

Greater Manchester Fire Authority – no response received.

Greater Manchester Pedestrian Association - no response received.

Greater Manchester Police (Design for Security) – a condition to reflect the physical security specifications set out in the Crime Impact Statement should be imposed should planning permission be granted.

Local Highway Authority – no objection subject to conditions.

Local Lead Flood Authority – no objection subject to a conditions requiring a scheme to improve the existing surface water drainage system based on the details within the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (February 2020) to be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Sport England – object on the grounds of increased traffic and impact of the proposed development on the cricket training facility.

Trafford Council, Arboriculturalist – no objections to the proposed development subject to conditions.

Trafford Council, Education Admissions – No objection in principle. Contribution towards off-site primary school provision requested.

Trafford Council, Heritage Development Officer – the application is located within the vicinity of three heritage assets:

- **Trafford Town Hall (Grade II listed)** - The proposed development will result in the loss of glimpses of the clock tower across the application site, however this harm is considered to be negligible.
- **Longford Park Conservation Area** – the proposed development will result in a minor change to the setting of Longford Park and the appreciation of the Conservation Area in views looking northwards across the open space. The proposed development, is also likely to also impact on the experience of the Park at night time which is a relatively dark space.
- **Old Trafford Cricket Ground and pavilion** – this is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. The submitted images indicate there is potential for the development to cause negligible harm to the setting of Old Trafford Cricket Ground. The proposed development will result in the loss of glimpses of the pavilion and cricket ground, however this harm is negligible.

Trafford Council, Housing Strategy – no objections in principle to the above planning application which will bring much needed residential units into Old Trafford. The scheme proposes to provide 333 units of residential accommodation which is a positive contribution towards addressing the housing needs of the borough. The mix of the proposed development is considered to be acceptable.

Trafford Council, Pollution & Licensing, Air Quality – there are no objections to the proposed development subject to the imposition of recommended conditions.

Trafford Council, Pollution & Licensing, Land Contamination - The submitted Phase 1 Environmental Risk Assessment report has identified that there may be risk associated with possible contamination from former commercial uses on the site. A condition is recommended to secure the submission of an investigation and risk assessment in relation to contamination on site.

Trafford Council, Pollution & Licensing, Nuisance – there are no objections to the proposed development subject to the imposition of recommended conditions.

Trafford Council, Strategic Planning – comments included within observations.

Trafford Council, Waste Management – no objections.

Transport for Greater Manchester – concern was raised with the modelling of the existing situation at the Talbot Road / Great Stone Road junction, as the results show that junction is operating above absolute capacity with the pm peak surveyed flows; this should not be the case as the surveyed flows only counted the traffic that passed through the junction. Consequently, TfGM recommended that the trip development and modelling was reassessed.

Further information was provided in the form of two Transport Assessment Addendums, however neither report addressed TfGM's concerns in relation to junction modelling and trip development.

Transport for Greater Manchester (Metrolink) – TfGM have advised that, in principle, Metrolink support the aspiration for a cycle/footway link to the Old Trafford Tram Stop, any such provision must be wholly at the expense of others and must not adversely impact Metrolink operations and/or maintenance responsibilities.

It is noted that the root protection area for the trees within the ownership of TfGM would likely extend into the application site. Concerns can be addressed by condition.

United Utilities – no objection subject to the imposition of recommended conditions.

REPRESENTATIONS

Four letters of representation have been received objecting to the proposed development on the following grounds:

- A leisure centre has been proposed for this site which would provide the residents of North Trafford with a brand new high quality facility that would benefit local residents;
- A housing development which is not in keeping with the area would be a major blow;
- The height of development does not fit in with the current houses in the area
- The level of car parking is insufficient and would lead to people parking on nearby estates causing disruption and traffic issues. One car parking space should be provided per flat;
- The site has always been a benefit to local residents, i.e. bowling alley, concert venue, B&Q;
- There are enough flats in the area and the development would be used for Air BnB for matches and concerts at both Old Trafford sporting grounds;
- The area needs more 3-4 bedroom reasonably priced family homes not more flats;
- One and two bedroom apartments will not be purchased by owner-occupiers in this area. The properties will be buy-to-let. It would be much more beneficial to provide a small estate of family homes, surrounded by green space and including a small park. The area includes good schools and transport links, and is ideal for families. This will bring stability and investment to the area in a way in which apartment blocks will not.

- Opposed to underground parking as this will create a dangerous underground space, open to exploitation by drug dealers. Parking should be on street level, next to houses. I would like to see secure cycle parking, and charge points for electric cars.
- It would also be beneficial to the area to include: a GP surgery; a small supermarket; a gym
- The site is too small, the road access is insufficient and cannot be improved as it is a bridge.
- As this site is below the bridge road lower flats will be in darkness all the time.
- Great Stone Road cannot cope with the additional traffic generated by this development. At rush hour Great Stone Road is bumper to bumper and the only possible way out will be onto this road

This application was called in to Planning Committee by Cllr Jarman on the following grounds:

- Although this application has been scaled back from the previous application the massing of the site is still too dense and the proposed heights of the tallest blocks I consider to be still too imposing. From the virtual representation I believe the external appearance of the building could also be improved.
- This is a key redevelopment site in the Civic Quarter Masterplan area and the councillors believe that a more strategic view of how this site should be utilised as a community asset is required.

OBSERVATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT AND THE DECISION-TAKING PROCESS

1. S38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF at paragraphs 2 and 47 reinforces this requirement and at paragraph 12 states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as a starting point for decision making, and that where a planning application conflicts with an **up to date** (emphasis added) development plan, permission should not normally be granted.
2. The Council's Core Strategy was adopted in January 2012, prior to the publication of the 2012 NPPF, but was drafted to be in compliance with it. It remains broadly compliant with much of the policy in the 2019 NPPF, particularly where that policy is not substantially changed from the 2012 version. It is acknowledged that policies controlling the supply of housing are out of date, not least because of the Borough's lack of a five year housing land supply, but other policies relevant to this application remain up to date and can be given full weight in the determination of this application. Whether a Core Strategy policy is considered to be up to date or out of date is identified in each of the relevant sections of this report and appropriate weight given to it.

3. The NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions, and as the Government's expression of planning policy and how this should be applied, should be given significant weight in the decision making process.
4. Paragraph 11 d) of the NPPF indicates that where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out of date, planning permission should be granted unless:
 - i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
 - ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.
5. Policies controlling the supply of housing and those relating to design and heritage are considered to be 'most important' for determining this application when considering the application against NPPF Paragraph 11 as they control the principle of the development and are relevant to the impact of this large building on the streetscene and the existing residents living close to the site. The Council does not, at present, have a five year supply of immediately available housing land and thus Policies L1 and L2 of the Core Strategy are 'out of date' in NPPF terms albeit other aspects of the policies such as affordable housing targets, dwelling type, size and mix are largely still up to date and so can be afforded substantial weight.
6. Policy L7 of the Core Strategy is considered to be compliant with the NPPF and therefore up to date as it comprises the local expression of the NPPF's emphasis on good design and, together with associated SPDs, the Borough's design code. Full weight can be afforded to this policy.
7. Policy R1 of the Core Strategy, relating to the historic environment, does not reflect case law or the tests of 'substantial' and 'less than substantial harm' in the NPPF. Thus, in respect of the determination of planning applications, Core Strategy Policy R1 is out of date. Although Policy R1 of the Core Strategy can be given limited weight, no less weight is to be given to the impact of the development on heritage assets as the statutory duties in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 are still engaged. Heritage policy in the NPPF can be given significant weight and is the appropriate means of determining the acceptability of the development in heritage terms.

The Strategic Location

8. The application site is located in the 'Lancashire Cricket Club Quarter' Strategic Location, which is covered by Core Strategy Policy SL3. It should be noted that in March 2020, the 'residential allowance' attributed to SL3 was uplifted from the Core Strategy target of 400, to a total of 2,800 units. It was also assumed that for the purposes of this residential allowance, the boundaries of SL3 were effectively amended to match the Civic Quarter AAP boundary.

9. Notwithstanding this update to the housing numbers that can be accommodated within the SL3 boundary, as the Council no longer has a five year supply of deliverable housing land, Policy SL3 still cannot be considered to be up-to-date for the purposes of Paragraph 11 as it refers specifically to the number of residential units which could be provided within the Strategic Location.
10. Nonetheless, in other respects the policy is considered to be broadly compliant with the NPPF as it seeks to deliver a strengthened mixed use community centred around the existing sporting and community facilities. The LCC Quarter is one of the most visited places in the Borough containing the sporting attraction that is the Cricket Club and a number of important community facilities such as Trafford Town Hall, Trafford College and Stretford Leisure Centre, the area is however also fragmented by a number of large footprint single uses. CS Policy SL3 identifies a significant opportunity to improve the visitor experience for its sporting attractions and to create a new residential neighbourhood.
11. CS Policy SL3 states that major mixed-use development will be delivered in this Location to provide a high quality experience for visitors balanced with a new, high quality residential neighbourhood centred around an improved stadium at LCC. CS Policy SL3 goes on to state that the Council considers that this Location can deliver:
 - A redeveloped LCC sports stadium with ancillary sports and leisure facilities;
 - 400 residential units (updated to 2,800 as noted above) comprising predominantly accommodation suitable for families;
 - A redeveloped and renovated Trafford Town Hall providing new accommodation for Trafford Council's administrative functions;
 - Improvements to education, community and commercial facilities (including a superstore); and
 - Improvements to the local highway network and better linkages with public transport infrastructure.
12. It should be noted that the LCC Strategic Location has already delivered a partially redeveloped LCC sports stadium, a redeveloped and renovated Trafford Town Hall, a superstore and some residential development. Improvements have also been made to the local highway network including the introduction of cycle route improvements along Talbot Road.
13. It should be noted however, that the Core Strategy does not limit the number of new dwellings to be provided within this location to 400 (updated to 2,800) and the proposed development of an additional 333 dwellings in this location would contribute significantly to the housing land supply.
14. The Draft Land Allocations Plan (LAP) is at a very early stage in its preparation and has been put on hold, pending the production of the Greater Manchester Strategic Framework, therefore has limited material weight in the determination of this application. With the exception of the Draft Civic Quarter Area Action Plan, the LAP remains the most recent statement of policy published by the

Council (2014) in respect of this site. The supporting Land Allocations Consultation Draft Policies Map identifies the LCC Quarter Strategic Location referred to in Core Strategy Policy SL3 as part of policies LAN1 (Lancashire County Cricket Club Quarter Strategic Location) and LAN2 (Lancashire County Cricket Club Stadium Area). The application site is located within LAN2.

15. Policy LAN1 identified the LCC Quarter Strategic Location as a location suitable for a mix of residential and supporting commercial and/or community uses to serve the needs of the proposed and existing communities within the Strategic Location. With regard to residential accommodation specifically, LAN 1 states that a minimum of 400 residential units should be delivered in the Plan period 2014 – 2026/27 and residential development will be encouraged at densities of between 30 and 150 dwellings per hectare in the form of a number of apartment blocks varying in height storeys. LAN 1 advises that development within this area should provide a range of 2, 3 and 4-bed dwellings provided in well-designed buildings with approximately two thirds of the units suitable for families. LAN1 further indicates that development within the Lancashire Cricket Club Quarter should be designed to a high quality, reflecting the significance of the Strategic Location as a visitor destination of Regional significance.
16. Policy LAN1 also encourages a mix of uses, including a range of retail uses (Use Classes A1 to A5), commercial, leisure and community facilities (Use Classes D1 and D2) at a scale to serve the needs of the proposed communities within the Strategic Location. This policy also details the provision of new open space and green infrastructure required to support the anticipated residential development in this area.
17. The Draft LAP states in Policy LAN 2 that the Council will support the continued use and improvement of the area identified on the Policies Map for a cricket stadium and associated hospitality, conference, club store, events, hotel and spectator/visitor car park uses by Lancashire Cricket Club. A range of commercial and/or community uses (including use classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1, C1, D1, D2 and similar appropriate uses) will be encouraged where they support the operation of the Stadium and are consistent with other policies within the Local Plan and relevant criteria within national policy. Residential development will be supported on sites fronting onto Great Stone Road and Talbot Road, including where it is part of a mixed-use scheme, the policy states.
18. It should be noted that the justification for Policy LAN2 states *“The function of the area as a stadium and major tourist destination should not be compromised through significant impact on the operation and/or amenity of the LCC Stadium or other uses in the vicinity of the proposal, including issues of security and overlooking.”*

Draft Civic Quarter Area Action Plan (AAP):

19. The Council has recently consulted on a Draft Civic Quarter Area Action Plan (AAP). This is intended to establish a vision, masterplan and strategy for how the area could be revitalised and developed over the next 15 years and

beyond. The AAP area covers the current application site as well as land as far north as Chester Road, Great Stone Road to the west, Trafford Bar Metrolink stop to the east and the Manchester-Altrincham Metrolink line to the south. This will form part of the Council's Development Plan and includes policies on a wide range of matters relevant to the development management process. Given that this is currently at 'Regulation 18' draft stage however, the weight to be afforded it in the determination of this application is limited, and it is not considered to be determinative document in the assessment of this planning application.

20. Although carrying limited weight at this time, the application site has been identified within the Draft AAP as an optimal location for consolidated car parking and complementary leisure-based activities, combined to serve as a centre of excellence for health and well-being, recreational and sporting offer for the area, working collaboratively with Stretford High School, UA92 and other schools and communities. The proposed development of a high density residential scheme does not accord with the vision for this site.
21. In the interest of achieving high quality urban design the draft AAP outlines key objectives in relation to form and massing, frontages, amenity and residential quality. Of relevance to this scheme are the following points:

Form and massing – developments should incorporate variation to scale and massing to create townscape interest, high quality outlook and maximise light penetration. Taller developments should incorporate large internal courtyards which are informed by an assessment of daylight and sunlight availability. These daylight and sunlight studies should also demonstrate that developments will minimise impacts to amenities and neighbouring areas and provides positive daylight conditions within dwellings. All homes should provide for direct sunlight to enter at least one habitable room for part of the day, with living areas and kitchen dining spaces receiving direct sunlight.

Frontages – the AAP advises that active frontages must be maximised with no more than 20% of the total frontage of each side of a perimeter block or development to be inactive. Lobbies to developments should be clearly articulated within the elevation to provide a clear and visible entrance and retail frontages should be fully integrated with the architecture of the building.

Amenity – there is an emphasis on providing private amenity space, with defensible space at ground floor level. Communal gardens must include playable spaces with incidental play sculptures, playable hard landscape features, grassed areas and planting.

Residential quality - all units must meet or exceed the minimum National Space Standards. The design of development must maximise dual aspect units (with a target of achieving more than 50% across the site), limit the number of single aspect units and seek to avoid north facing single aspect units which will be permitted for non-family dwellings and in exceptional circumstances only.

22. The Refreshed Stretford Masterplan had shown that a leisure centre might be built on the former Kellogg's site. However, the Draft AAP, building on the principles set out in the RSM, reflects and advances the ambition set out in the RSM to improve the leisure offer available within this part of the Borough, identifying the former B & Q site as the optimal location for a leisure centre. Like the Draft AAP, the RSM can only carry limited weight and is not considered to be a determinative document in the assessment of this planning application.

Housing Land Supply

23. The NPPF places great emphasis on the need to plan for and deliver new housing throughout the UK. The Government's current target is for 300,000 homes to be constructed each year to help address the growing housing crisis. Local planning authorities are required to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. With reference to paragraph 59 of the NPPF, this means ensuring that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed, and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. Within the Core Strategy, the first Strategic Objective - SO1 - recognises the importance of promoting sufficient housing across the Borough to meet Trafford's needs.
24. Policy L1 of the Trafford Core Strategy seeks to release sufficient land to accommodate 12,210 new dwellings (net of clearance) over the plan period up to 2026. Regular monitoring has revealed that the rate of building is failing to meet the housing land target and the latest monitoring suggests that the Council's supply is in the region of only 2.4 years. Therefore, there exists a significant need to not only meet the level of housing land supply identified within Policy L1 of the Core Strategy, but also to make up for a recent shortfall in housing completions.
25. Policy L2 of the Core Strategy indicates that all new residential proposals will be assessed for the contribution that would be made to meeting the Borough's housing needs. The location of the application site is significant in that it sits immediately adjacent to the Old Trafford Metrolink stop, with quick and easy access to retail and other facilities in Manchester City Centre, as well as Stretford, Sale and Altrincham. The development itself will also provide some local centre uses and public open space.
26. The NPPF requires policies and decisions to support development that makes efficient use of land; including giving substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and to support the development of under-utilised land, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively (paragraph 118). That the proposed development site is a vacant, brownfield site in a sustainable location in a borough that does not have a five year rolling supply of housing land is acknowledged, as is the recognition that the site represents an opportunity to deliver a high density scheme. However, the NPPF also makes it clear, at

Paragraph 122 that the requirement to make efficient use of land must take into account, amongst other matters, the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character, and the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places. That the site is suitable for a high density residential led scheme is not disputed. However, the number of units proposed leads to a development which is entirely out of scale with its surroundings. A scheme could be brought forward which makes beneficial use of this brownfield site and delivers a sizeable number of units without the commensurate harm. These matters are discussed later in the report.

Housing Mix

27. The NPPF at paragraph 61 requires local planning authorities to plan for an appropriate mix of housing to meet the needs of its population and to contribute to the achievement of balanced and sustainable communities. This approach is supported by Policy L2 of the Core Strategy, which refers to the need to ensure that a range of house types, tenures and sizes are provided.
28. Policy L2 of the Core Strategy indicates that the proposed mix of dwelling types and sizes should contribute to meeting the housing needs of the Borough as set out in the Council's Housing Strategy and Housing Market Assessment. Policy L2 sets out that the Council will seek to achieve a target split of 70:30; small:large (3+ beds) with 50% of the "small" homes being accommodation suitable for families. Policy L2.7 also states that the development of one bed room dwellings will normally only be considered acceptable for schemes that support the regeneration of Trafford's town centres and the Regional Centre. For the LCC Quarter Strategic Location, Policy SL3 of the Core Strategy states residential development should provide accommodation suitable for families.
29. The proposed development would provide for a mix of two x studio units (1%), 108 x 1 bed (32%), 190 x 2 bed (57%) and 33 x 3 bed (10%). This equates to a split of 90:10 small:large units - a significantly higher proportion of small units than the target set out in Policy L2. All of the two bedroom units comply with minimum national described standards, and are capable of accommodating three persons, whilst 21 of the two bedroom properties are of a size capable of accommodating four persons with floorspace in excess of 70 sq m. Thus all of the two bed units could be considered to provide smaller two bed family accommodation.
30. It is noted that the proposed units are generally all in compliance with the nationally described space standards, with the majority of one beds being suitable for one person and a small proportion appropriate for two persons. The three bed units all exceed the national described standards and provide a mix of units capable of accommodating four, five and six persons.
31. The applicant has sought to justify the proposed housing mix with a Housing Needs Statement and has explained that three bedroom apartments are not typically provided in high rise apartment schemes, where developers often only providing studios, one and two bedroom apartments, as they seek to maximise the number of properties in the building to improve viability. However, the

provision of 33, three bedroom apartments in this scheme is in direct response to the needs of the market as identified by Policy L2 and the SHMA. Of the smaller apartments provided, the majority are two bedrooms, as required by Policy L2.

32. Overall the proposed housing mix fails to comply with the requirements of Policy L2, however consultation with the Council's Housing Strategy officer has been undertaken and they have advised that the mix of proposed units is acceptable. The proposed mix of units would provide a range of new homes for families and smaller households and so in terms of housing mix, the scheme is considered appropriate for this Strategic Location.

Affordable Housing

33. The NPPF states that for major development involving the provision of housing, at least 10% of the homes should be available for affordable home ownership. In respect of the provision of affordable housing, at the local level, the requirement to secure an affordable contribution is covered by Core Strategy Policy L2.
34. Core Strategy Policy L2 does not capture the broader range of affordable housing categories advanced by the NPPF and is thus out of date on this point. Nevertheless, L2 seeks to ensure that a range of housing tenures are provided across the Borough which helps to secure the achievement of balanced and sustainable communities in line with the general tenor of advice on this point set out within Paragraph 61 of the NPPF. Policy L2 is clear that in respect of all qualifying development appropriate affordable provision should be made.
35. In recognising that the Borough does not perform as a single uniform property market, the policy explains that Trafford is split into three broad market locations which have different percentage requirements for the provision of affordable housing. As corroborated by the accompanying Supplementary Planning Document (Revised SPD1: Planning Obligations, July 2014), which draws upon the recommendations of the Trafford Economic Viability Study (2009 and a 2011 update), the application site is located within a 'cold market location.' In such locations, provision of affordable housing at a lower level is typically sought than in 'moderate' and 'hot' market locations. Policy L2 and SPD1 also recognise that different market conditions can apply throughout a development plan period which also impact upon the level of affordable provision that a new residential development can successfully sustain. 'Poor market conditions' had been in force since the Core Strategy's adoption which was in recognition of the UK housing market undergoing a period of significant downturn following the 2008 recession. However, in recent years the residential market has shown signs of recovery and has now re-stabilised. It follows that in November 2018 a recommendation of officers to accept a shift to 'good market conditions' for the purposes of negotiating affordable housing and applying Policy L2 and SPD1 was accepted by the Planning and Development Management Committee. The effect therefore, is, that within this 'cold market location' and under present 'good market conditions' a 10% affordable housing target will normally be applied.

36. However, in addition to the application of the affordable housing policy on the basis of geographical and market conditions, Policy L2 and SPD1 go on to explain that *“In areas where the nature of the development is such that, in viability terms, it will perform differently to generic developments within a specified market location, the affordable housing contribution will be determined via a site specific viability study, and will not normally exceed 40%”*. SPD1 also states that this approach to the application of Policy L2 and SPD1 will apply in the case of most of the strategic locations.
37. In this instance it is considered that the proposed development will, in viability terms, perform differently to generic developments within the Old Trafford Market Area. Cushman & Wakefield (viability consultant for the applicant) argue that the existing building would have a higher alternative use value (AUV) if refurbished than the residual land value (RLV) generated from the proposed residential development. Cushman & Wakefield calculate an AUV of £3,524,578 based on refurbishing and then selling the existing retail warehouse with the RLV generated for the proposed residential scheme being £3,482,000. Generic new build residential developments would expect the change of use would generate a higher value, at B&Q the applicant is arguing the proposed residential use has a lower value than the alternative use.
38. The restrictions on the existing use of the site through a planning condition and the subject property’s current condition is another reason why the site in viability terms will perform differently to other generic developments in the area. As the site can only be leased to a DIY operator and that the condition of the building would inhibit it being suitable for a DIY operator, this means it is hard to generate an EUV for the site. Therefore, the subject site has a very low EUV when compared to other schemes in Old Trafford, which is a reason why it would operate differently in viability terms.
39. In addition, the total finance costs assumed amount to £4,469,377 as a result of the development phasing assumed by Cushman & Wakefield. It is assumed that all 333 apartments proposed would be delivered in one phase. This is a unique approach to take for a scheme of this scale, it would be anticipated in generic developments that the proposal would be delivered in multiple phases generating a much reduced finance cost.
40. Given the three reasons identified above it is considered that the fourth bullet point of adopted Core Strategy (2012) Policy L2.12 is engaged, as it is demonstrated that the proposed development will perform differently in viability terms to generic development in the Old Trafford Market Area and it is appropriate to review the applicant’s Financial Viability Appraisal (FVA) to determine whether the proposed development is capable of supporting up to 40% affordable housing provision.
41. The application proposes the provision of 10% affordable housing comprising 17 x 1 bed units and 17 x 2 bed units.

42. The applicant's FVA was reviewed by the Council's independent viability advisor who does not consider that the appraisal meets the required tests set out in the NPPF and PPG to demonstrate unequivocally that if Planning Policy requirements for affordable housing is greater than is being proposed (10% affordable housing), the Former B&Q Site, Old Trafford scheme would be undeliverable on viability grounds. The proposed development is therefore considered to be contrary Core Strategy Policy L2 in this regard. Discussions with the applicant are continuing and an update will be provided within the Additional Information Report.

Summary of principle of residential development:

43. Whilst the Council's housing supply policies are considered to be out-of-date in that it cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, the scheme achieves many of the aspirations which the policies seek to deliver. Specifically, the proposal contributes towards meeting the Council's housing land targets and housing needs identified in Core Strategy Policies L1 and L2 in that the scheme will deliver 333 new residential units on a brownfield site in a sustainable location within the urban area. It is also considered to be acceptable in relation to Core Strategy Policies L1.7 and L1.8, in that it helps towards meeting the wider Strategic and Place Objectives of the Core Strategy. The absence of a continuing supply of housing land has significant consequences in terms of the Council's ability to contribute towards the Government's aim of boosting significantly the supply of housing. Significant weight should therefore be afforded in the determination of this planning application to the scheme's contribution to addressing the identified housing shortfall, and meeting the Government's objective of securing a better balance between housing demand and supply.

Non- residential uses

44. The submitted planning application also seeks planning permission for the development of two flexible commercial units measuring 180m² and 168m². The permission seeks to keep these uses flexible and interchangeable and proposes the following uses:
- Café (use class A3)
 - Convenience retail serving the local residential population (use class A1);
 - Community facility such as 'drop-in' health care clinic, hireable meeting space or temporary 'pop up' uses (use class D1); and/or
 - Gym and fitness suite serving the local market (use class D2).
45. Paragraph 86 of the NPPF requires local planning authorities to apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses which are not located within an existing centre. Main town centre uses should be located in town centres, then in edge of centre locations; and only if suitable sites are not available (or expected to become available within a reasonable period) should out of centre sites be considered.
46. The use classes proposed as part of this development fall within the definition of 'main town centre uses' in the NPPF.

47. Policy W2 of the Core Strategy, which is considered to be compliant with the NPPF in supporting the growth of town centres and the role they play in local communities and is therefore up-to-date for the purposes of decision making. It states that outside the established retail centres, there will be a presumption against the development of retail, leisure and other town centre-type uses except where it can be demonstrated that they satisfy the tests outlined in current Government Guidance.
48. A sequential test was submitted in support of this planning application, which assessed the level of floor space on an aggregated basis and assessed the availability of floorspace (ranging between 307 m² and 356 m², allowing for a flexibility of 10% in floorspace area either way) within an agreed search area.
49. The assessment focused on Great Stone Road Neighbourhood Centre and Gorse Hill and Trafford Bar Local Centres. All vacant sites within the defined centre and within circa 300m (edge of centre) were assessed.
50. The assessment found that there were no sequentially preferable sites within, or on the edge of the identified centres. Officers have analysed the submitted assessment and concluded that the applicant has satisfied the requirements of the sequential test, in that it has been demonstrated that there are no sequentially preferable sites (either within or closer to established retail centres) that could accommodate the proposed retail units and the principle of the proposed commercial uses comply with Core Strategy policy W2.

DESIGN AND APPEARANCE

Policy Background

51. The promotion of high standards of design is a central narrative within the NPPF. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF outlines three objectives which are key to achieving sustainable development, one of which is a social objective. The delivery of a well-designed and safe built environment is part of achieving that strong social objective. The NPPF continues, at paragraph 124, that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 130 urges local planning authorities to refuse development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. It continues, that, when determining applications, great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help to raise the standards of design more generally in an area.
52. The Core Strategy also attaches importance to the design and quality of the Borough's built environment. The text supporting Policy L7 advises that high quality design is a key factor in improving the quality of places and in delivering environmentally sustainable developments. Design solutions must: be appropriate to their context; and enhance the street scene by appropriately addressing scale, density, height, massing, layout, elevational treatment,

materials, hard and soft landscaping, and boundary treatments, the policy is clear. Policy L7 is considered to be compliant with the NPPF as it comprises the local expression of the NPPF's emphasis on good design and, together with associated SPDs, the Borough's design code. It can therefore be given full weight in the decision making process.

53. Both the supporting text to L7 and paragraph 129 of the NPPF also stress the importance of using tools such as Building for Life in the design of development.

The National Design Guide (NDG) published in October 2019 seeks to demonstrate how well-designed places that are beautiful, enduring and successful can be achieved in practice. The NDG outlines the ten characteristics which contribute towards the cross-cutting themes for good design set out in the NPPF – character, community and climate.

54. The site is occupied by a vacant single storey retail warehouse which does not positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area. The ground level of the existing site is generally level, however Great Stone Road rises in height the highway.

The Proposed Development

55. The proposed development comprises the construction of two residential blocks of apartments which are between four and nine storeys in height, excluding the basement car park. The proposed basement car park sits circa 1.5 metres below the existing site level, which results in a podium style development for the northern block of development. No topographical survey was submitted as part of the application.
56. The site as existing is generally level; however it is sited adjacent to the Metrolink line with Great Stone Road rising in height to create a bridge over the Metrolink line. Much of the site therefore sits below the adopted highway.
57. Two new pedestrian accesses are proposed along the site frontage to Great Stone Road, one at a central point to the development and one at the southern end, adjacent to the Metrolink line.
58. Due to the nature of the site levels the two most southerly pedestrian accesses are not level with the ground floor level and instead provide a raised link into the development, with a raised footbridge link connecting these two accesses.
59. The northern block of development is generally square in its floorplan layout with a break in the Great Stone Road frontage providing access through the site. There is a two storey undercroft through the rear elevation connecting to the pedestrian pathway which runs around the perimeter of the site. The rear elevation of the northern block has a small projecting element facing the southern block of development which has an inverse 'L' shaped floorplan.

60. The site layout retains the existing vehicular access at the north western corner of the site. This access point also provides a level pedestrian access from Great Stone Road to the pedestrian pathway running around the perimeter of the site. In the long term the applicant hopes to join the development to a new pedestrian link to Old Trafford Metrolink stop.
61. Access to the residential units is either gained via the car park lifts or via access points within the internal courtyards. The northern courtyard provides three entrances to the northern development block and two entrances to the two central development blocks. There are two entrances to the southern block from within the courtyard and one entrance facing Great Stone Road.
62. The site access layout is complex and is illustrated in the plan bundle 'Accessibility Information' and pages 24 to 27 of the Amended Design and Access Statement which should be read in conjunction with the following plans PL_102 'Level 0 Plan Rev D' and PL_103 'Level 1 Plan'. The issue of accessibility is explored in detail later in this report at paragraphs 102 to 109.
63. Car parking is provided at in the basement level which extends across approximately 50% of the site and provides car parking for 98 vehicles. The basement car park results in parked vehicles being shielded from the public highway and provides a level development platform for the proposed development. The basement also provides refuse storage facilities, cycle parking and a plant room.
64. Public realm and landscaping is proposed to the front and rear of the site, within the courtyards and at roof top level.
65. The front elevation of the proposed development is located between 9 and 14.5 metres from the adopted highway, Great Stone Road.
66. The norther western boundary is sited approximately 9.9 metres from the adjacent LCC car park, between 6.4 and 10 metres from the north eastern boundary with LCC and between 3.6 and 4 metres from the south eastern boundary with the Metrolink line. The proposed development has a width of 110 metres across the site and is between 65 and 68 metres deep.
67. The front elevation of the proposed development is between four and seven storeys in height. The proposed development steps up in height to the rear (north eastern elevation) of the site to nine storeys in height through the gradual stepping of the northern, central and southern blocks of development which run NW to SE through the site. Due to the podium style development on the northern part of the site the height of these nine storey blocks varies between 27.4 and 25.9 metres above existing ground level.
68. The north western elevation which is visible when approaching the site from Talbot Road rises in height in two steps from four storeys in height to five storeys and finally to seven storeys. The south eastern elevation which is visible on the approach from The Quadrant/Chorlton direction steps up in height from seven to nine storeys in one change of building height. The central

section of the proposed development rises in height from five to eight to nine storeys, but in a different arrangement to the setbacks on the north western elevation. These set-backs can be seen in full on the north western and south eastern elevations and courtyard section B-B (drawings PL_201, PL_203 and PL_222 B respectively).

69. The front elevation creates an active frontage to Great Stone Road with commercial units also present at first floor/podium level.
70. The façade treatment of the proposed is contemporary in design and incorporates various design features such as projecting brick feature panels, terracotta baguette detailing to vertical balcony screens, angled brick panels to add window details and windows sets backs. Drawing PL_202 indicates that the side and rear elevations continue a similar level of detail as noted on the front elevations. It is considered appropriate for further details confirming the design approach on the side and rear elevations to be secured before the appeal is determined.

Townscape Visual Impact Assessment

71. Visual Impact Assessments provide a useful tool to help identify the effects of new developments on views and on the landscape and townscape itself. They allow changes to views and landscape/townscape to be understood and ultimately inform the design of the proposed development.
72. 'Townscape effects' relate to the impact on the physical characteristics or components of the environment which together form the character of that townscape, including buildings, roads, paths, vegetation and water areas. 'Visual effects' relate to impacts on individuals whose views of that townscape could change as a result of the proposed development, such as residents, pedestrians, people working in offices, or people in vehicles passing through the area.
73. The applicant submitted an amended Landscape/Townscape Visual Impact Appraisal (TVIA), following the request of additional viewpoints from Longford Park Conservation Area. The submitted TVIA includes fifteen wireframe viewpoints, the location of which can be seen at Appendix 1, which were produced to inform the TVIA. These viewpoints provide a visual representation of what the proposed development would look like from each viewpoint.
74. Additional viewpoints (VP) were requested including a portrait representation of VP1 and VP5, a VP from Longford Park and from within the cricket ground were requested during the course of this application. A viewpoint from Longford Park Conservation Area was submitted and a CGI was submitted indicating a view within the cricket ground. The request for portrait versions of VP1 or VP5 to show the full visual impact of the building was not addressed by the applicant.
75. The submitted Landscape/Townscape Visual Impact Appraisal (TVIA) also analyses the TVIA produced in support of the Draft Civic Quarter AAP by

Randall Thorp and considers the extent to which the character area descriptions outlined in the TVIA supporting the Draft Civic Quarter AAP are relevant in the context of the proposal site.

76. Although the AAP TVIA is not relevant to the determination of this application, the applicant's appraisal of the AAP TVIA is of interest as it supports the applicant's justification for the scale of the proposed development.
77. In summary the AAP TVIA locates the application site in the '*Southern Neighbourhood*' and in terms of townscape character assesses it as forming part of the '*Sports and Recreational character area*'. This character area is noted to be of 'moderate townscape quality' and of 'high' value (paragraph 4.23). The AAP TVIA advises on appropriate heights for development in the various locations in the AAP area and advises that development on the application site should be low level, at less than 6 storeys as there are "sensitivities to height due to the proximity to neighbouring suburban homes."
78. The applicant's TVIA also disagrees with some of the conclusions of the AAP TVIA. The areas of disagreements and criticism are as follows:
- The description of the townscape character area in the AAP TVIA focuses on the sports and recreational use of the area and does not acknowledge the mixed uses in the area (Lancastrian House and the former B&Q) and states that the Townscape Character Area "*appears to have been named a Sports and Recreational Area to be in keeping with the Civic Area Action Plan's Vision for the Southern Neighbourhood which is for a public centre of excellence for health and wellbeing, sport and exercise.*"
 - The applicant's TVIA states that the AAP TVIA assessment of the townscape quality and value of the sports and recreational area focuses mainly on the perceived high value of the Cricket Ground and does not consider the moderate to low value of the offices, car parking and former B&Q site. The applicants consider the value for the character area to be 'good' as opposed to the AAP TVIA which values the character as 'high'.
 - The applicant's TVIA states that "*Randall Thorp's analysis regarding height does not consider design factors that could reduce the impacts on the neighbouring residential area such as stepping back building height in transition. This would help building integration into the townscape setting between residential use and mixed urban use*"
 - The AAP TVIA advises that the Civic Quarter AAP proposals would bring moderate change that is generally beneficial in nature to the surrounding area. The applicant's TVIA agrees that the changes would be beneficial to the area, but states "*it could be argued that the level of change could be higher due to the scale of the changes affecting the whole character area. It is worth noting that the proposed residential scheme (the proposal assessed within this document) would only change the south-west corner of the area whilst still having a beneficial change based on good-design and being congruous with the surrounding mixed use architecture.*"
 - The applicant's TVIA disagrees with the AAP TVIA's assessment of the townscape value of the residential area as having a moderate sense of place, and instead considers it to be low. It should however be noted that the residential area for the purposes of the AAP is wide ranging and covers areas surrounding the whole AAP area and also pockets within it, therefore

the 'sense of place' throughout the 'residential area' as defined in the AAP TVIA will inevitably vary.

- The AAP TVIA states that the Southern Neighbourhood Area proposals would have a medium magnitude of change on the neighbouring residential area which would be beneficial in nature due to having a positive change to the townscape setting. The applicant's TVIA consider that as large parts of the adjacent character area will experience limited to no intervisibility with the Southern Neighbourhood Area proposals, a medium-low change appears more appropriate.
79. The applicant's TVIA states that it is considered the proposed development would *"be of a similar nature to the height and massing of the leisure centre and car parking areas proposed within the Area Action Plan and that the proposed residential schemes would also have a similar susceptibility to change."* Although it is unknown what height and massing any potential leisure centre would be on this site, it is not considered that a leisure development is likely to be of the scale the applicant claims.
80. It should be noted that the massing study in the AAP TVIA assesses the development site on the basis of four and two storey development. The maximum height of six storeys in this area is intended to be just that, a maximum and it is not intended that six storeys would spans across the whole site.
81. In terms of impact on the Sports and Recreational Townscape Character Area, the applicant's TVIA considers the overall townscape quality to be Good-Ordinary with low susceptibility to change from the proposed development. The value is considered to be Good and the quality is considered Good-Ordinary resulting in the sensitivity to change being Medium.
82. The TVIA goes on to state that:

"The varied heights of the site from 4 to 8 storeys would integrate with the existing varied heights of the up to 3 storey high residential area and the 5 to 6 storey buildings within and around the Sports and Recreational TCA. The other parts of the Civic Area Action Plan facilitate far taller buildings to the north and north-east from 7 to 11+ storeys high. The design of the proposed development has considered the surrounding height differences and has stepped back the building height in transition to reduce the impacts on the neighbouring residential area. The transitional approach to the building height will also integrate the proposed development into the townscape setting between the residential area and the mixed urban area.

The proposed development would not affect the key characteristics of TCA which is the Lancashire County Cricket Club and would be a positive change with the loss of the degraded former B&Q site. The addition of the proposed development would be of good-design and congruous with the surrounding mixed use architecture. The magnitude of change to the Sports and Recreational TCA would be a Medium-Low Change and the Overall Landscape Effects would be Moderate-Slight Beneficial."

83. It should be noted that the development is four to nine storeys in height, not eight as stated in the applicant's TVIA. The models within the TVIA do however appear to accurately to reflect the height of the proposed development.
84. With regard to impacts on the adjacent residential area, the applicant's TVIA considers the proposed development would indirectly affect other townscape character areas within the study area and that these effects would not be detrimental. The TVIA goes on to state that the residential area is *"of ordinary-poor quality and the value Low as it is residential area that has a low sense of place with no noted significance or distinct features. Randall Thorp acknowledges that it is normal for the residential area to experiences views towards higher buildings located on the periphery of the TCA. This appraisal considers a low susceptibility to change for the residential area due to the existing influence of taller buildings resulting in a Low Sensitivity.*

The proposed development would indirectly impact on part of the residential area with large parts of the character area experiencing limited to no intervisibility of the proposed development. The change would be congruous with the surrounding mixed urban area while the nature of change would be beneficial as the proposed change would be an improvement in quality and condition to the surrounding mixed urban area already with tall buildings nearby. The magnitude of change to the Residential Area TCA would be Medium-Low and the overall landscape effects would be Moderate-Slight Beneficial."

85. The applicant's TVIA concludes that the proposed development will be visible from locations close to the proposal site. They consider that the townscape and visual changes which will result from the development will be contained to a relatively small area with, recorded visual effects over moderate substantial only occurring within 0.6 km from the site, and then only where views of the building are possible. The applicant considers that the nature of change which will result from the scale and appearance of the proposed development will be noticeable and prominent but not always adverse. The applicant's TVIA considers that some change from a number of vantage points would be neutral and potentially beneficial in nature. The applicant's TVIA also states that *"no notable townscape effects are recorded and no notable effects are assessed for the local conservation and historic assets. For those visual effects that are notable at moderate-substantial or above, the mitigation proposals reduce some of these over time through screening and integration. Those that remain are expected to become over time an accepted part of the established urban scene with the nature of change altering from adverse to neutral."*
86. The additional viewpoints from Longford Park and within the cricket ground were requested to enable additional assessments to be made with regard to concerns over the potential impact of development on heritage assets. Further assessment on this point can be found at paragraphs 139 to 154.
87. It is considered that the TVIA attaches too much weight to the taller buildings to the north of the site and does not provide sufficient consideration of the larger

proportion of the surrounding area which has a prevailing height of two storeys. It is also considered that the assessment of the effect of the proposed development on character has generally under-stated the likely scale of the development in comparison with the existing buildings surrounding the cricket club, Metrolink stop and office developments off Talbot Road. The assessment describes the existing buildings (which are a maximum of six storeys in height and visually permeable with glimpses between the blocks of Lancastrian House and LCC possible) as being 'broadly similar and coherent in scale' as the proposed development which extends to the equivalent of nine storeys. It is considered that this is an inaccurate judgement on the relative heights of the proposed development and surrounding existing buildings. The proposed development offers very limited views through the site and the side blocks (NW and SE elevations) are generally unbroken except for single a step in heights. The six storey elements of the Lancastrian Office Block measure circa. 18 metres in height and the LCC stadium has a general height of 20 metres.

88. It is also considered that the predicted magnitude of change for some of the views has been understated and the use of landscape (rather than portrait photography) in visualisations has meant that the upper part of the building is not shown in some images, particularly VP 1 and VP5. This gives an incomplete and inaccurate representation of the likely visual impact of the proposals.
89. It is considered that the conclusion of the TVIA that there would be 'no notable townscape effects' arising from the proposed development is an inaccurate summary of the likely impact of the development and the proposals are likely to result in some significant impacts on the local townscape character and key views, particularly when travelling along Great Stone Road and when viewed from Longford Park Conservation Area. Whilst it is acknowledged that some effects will be beneficial such as the introduction of a new active frontage along Great Stone Road and the removal of the existing building on site, the scheme is also likely to result in negative townscape and visual effects. These primarily relate to the scale and massing of the proposed scheme which is out of scale with the character of not just its immediate context, but the wider surrounding area.
90. The visual representations 1 to 3, 5, 8, 9, 14 and 15 included in Appendix 1.0 of the amended TVIA demonstrate that the proposed development will be highly visible from a number of viewpoints. Its prominence is exacerbated by the scale, height and massing of the proposed development and it is clear within the viewpoints that there are no developments of a comparable scale and massing which sit within the same viewpoint. This indicates that the scale of the proposed development is out of keeping with the general character of the development area.

Scale, height and massing of proposed development

91. This planning application includes scale as a matter to be determined as part of this outline planning application. Scale is defined as the height, width and

length of each building proposed within the development in relation to its surroundings.

92. The proposed development is nine storeys in height at its highest, stepping down to four to seven storeys in height along the Great Stone Road site frontage.
93. The Great Stone Road frontage is split into three blocks development. The northern block of development measures 16 metres in width, whilst the central and southern blocks measure 34 and 36 metres in width respectively.
94. The rear element of the proposed development is broken up into two blocks of development, which step from five to seven, eight and nine storeys in height. As noted in paragraph 67 of this report, due to the podium style development on the northern part of the site the height of these nine storey blocks varies between 27.4 and 25.9 metres.
95. There is only one complete break in the building block forming the rear elevation of the site, between the central and southern blocks, measuring 12 metres. The rear elevation of the southern block measures 16 metres in width. The rear elevation of the northern and central blocks measures 75 metres in width with a break of only 14.5 metres around the central point of the rear block, above the fifth storey level. The northern and southern blocks of development are between 66 and 68 metres in depth.
96. The Design and Access Statement does not include an explanation as to how the approach to layout or height of the proposed development has been derived, or how alternative forms of development may have been considered at the outset of the design process, such as a larger number of smaller building blocks. The NPPF seeks to make efficient use of land, however there is a difference between making and efficient use of land and delivering and appropriately scaled scheme. The applicant's intent however, seems to have been to design the scheme to maximise the number of residential units that can be accommodated on the site with little thought for the site's context or the residents living around it. The applicant's initial proposal for the site (albeit this was only the subject of a pre-application enquiry) was for a three high rise towers ranging from 12 to 26 storeys in height. This was not pursued, but instead application reference 94974/OUT/18 was submitted (a single building covering the whole site and varying in height from five to 13 storeys). The current scheme represents a trimmed down version of this.
97. A brief scale analysis is included at page 7 of the DAS which assesses development surrounding the application site into 'Large scale mass' and 'Small scale mass'. The DAS explains that the 'large scale stadium' at LCC has 'been a main influence of the scheme's varied massing' and makes reference to tall buildings on Talbot Road being '*up to 10 storeys high*'. The DAS goes on to state the "*proposal steps down towards Great Stone Rd in response to the low-rise housing to the west. This forms a screen to the higher massing along the eastern edge of the site*".

98. Page 8 of the DAS examines the immediate context of the site, although some of the images are taken from 0.7km from the site with three of the six buildings taken as context (Lancastrian House, UA92 and Oakland House) addressing a primary route into the city (Talbot Road). It is not considered that the assessment of the immediate context in the DAS accurately represents the true site context.
99. The LPA consider the context of the site to be largely characterised by domestic scale buildings on Great Stone Road and Trent Bridge Walk. The cricket club forms the setting for the site, and although the structures on site are large, they are of a massing and layout which provide glimpses through the site and does not dominate the local landscape. The Lancastrian House office development (at two and six storeys in height) is also acknowledged to represent a larger scale development in the context of this site than the adjacent domestic dwellings, however, the form and massing of this development with four narrow six storey blocks (12 metres wide by 40 metres long) being separated by four, 33 metre long two storey blocks, provides views through the development and the six storey blocks, which results in a development which does not dominate the local townscape.
100. As seen in the visual representations included within the TVIA the proposed development does not sit within the context of other large scale development and is predominantly viewed against a setting of two storey residential dwellings, the cricket spectator stands which are approximately six storeys in height and the adjacent Lancastrian House office development, which is two and six storeys in height. Whilst the floodlighting columns are seen in views these do not dominate the views or local skyline.
101. Overall it is considered that the proposed scheme results in the development of a large scale residential building which has no comparator in the local area whilst the imposing scale and mass of the building fails to respond sensitively to the adjacent two storey dwellings or the stands that sit within the cricket ground. It is not clear whether there would be a requirement for roof top plant on the building. In the absence of such information, it has to be assumed that plant will be sited on top of the roof, which will only add to the building's height and mass. Furthermore, it is not considered that the area set aside for planting along the rear boundary of the site would provide adequate space for a landscaping scheme to flourish and soften the appearance of the proposed development.

Layout and accessibility

102. This planning application includes layout as a matter to be determined as part of this outline planning application. Layout is defined as the way in which buildings, routes and open spaces within the development are provided, situated and orientated in relation to each other and to buildings and spaces outside the development. The submitted plans are not fully detailed, for example, annotated room layouts are not included on the floor plans. The submitted details are however considered to be sufficient to determine the acceptability of the site layout.

103. The site layout retains the existing vehicular access point from Great Stone Road and upgrades this to create an access road along the northern side elevation serves the basement car park.
104. The site layout addresses the change in levels of Great Stone Road through the use of a podium across the northern section of the site which allows the proposed development to address Great Stone Road at a level which is accessible by pedestrians at various points along its frontage.
105. As noted in the previous section which outlines the details of the proposed development, access to the site is complex with the varying site levels between Great Stone Road and the application site. As a result of these site levels, access is gained via mix of level and stepped pedestrian access points to the two courtyards and development blocks as outlined below.
106. The northern pedestrian access provides a level access to one of the proposed flexible commercial units (noted as a café) and the southern courtyard. The northern courtyard is accessible via a platform lift adjacent to the proposed retail unit or steps. An additional platform lift proposed in the central block of development which provides access between the southern and northern courtyards.
107. The central pedestrian access is level with Great Stone Road for approximately nine metres before reaching a stepped access down to the southern courtyard. The most southerly pedestrian access is stepped upwards directly from Great Stone Road and provides access into the southern block of development.
108. A platform lift to the ground floor level is provided in the north western corner of the car park and this would provide access to the commercial unit and the pathway along the north western side elevation.
109. Four lifts provide access to all levels from the basement car park to every floor in the northern and central blocks of development and two further lifts provide access to floors from ground level upwards in the southern block. There is no basement car park on the southern part of the site.
110. The developer has indicated the intention to provide a connection to the Old Trafford Metrolink in the future. At this time however, this is not possible as the proposed connection would require the use of land which is currently in the ownership of LCC.
111. The proposed development is set back from the back edge of the pedestrian footpath along Great Stone Road by between 9 metres and 14.5 metres and incorporates two full height openings into both courtyards. The front facades of the proposed development also incorporate set-backs to the upper floors of development which combined with the openings provide visual interest and texture.

112. The proposed development seeks to create an active frontage to Great Stone Road with pedestrian access points and commercial units at the ground floor. It is considered that this is achieved with a degree of success along Great Stone Road in relation to the northern block, however the central block of development is screened by the embankment to the site as a result of the rising road level of Great Stone Road and the appearance of an active frontage across the site frontage varies.
113. The remaining three elevations however, have little animation at ground floor level, however private terrace/garden areas are proposed to ground floor units to the majority of the internal and external perimeters. Landscaping details do not form part of this application however the Landscape Design Statement indicates that hedgerow planting will delineate these spaces.
114. The communal entrances to each block are provided within the internal courtyards. Communal entrances should bring variation and interest to the building, should be visible from the street and be clearly identified.
115. Basic courtyard elevations have been provided for review, however they are limited in detail. Due to the late submission of these details it has not been possible to secure further information, however on the basis of the information submitted, it is not possible to discern where on the elevations the building entrances are, without cross-referencing the floorplans. Without further detail, it is not possible to comment on the acceptability of the proposed access points with regard to the accessibility and layout of the development.
116. The layout of the proposal results in two blocks of development. The proposed development incorporates a gap through the southern courtyard, which creates a sense of permeability, however the northern courtyard has a limited level of permeability with a two storey undercroft providing access through the courtyard and a break in the height of development above this undercroft area, resulting in development with an overall height of five storeys, excluding the raised podium.
117. The proposed development seeks to maximise the width of the site and results in a layout which is four metres from the boundary with the Metrolink line. This boundary is heavily landscaped with a number of mature trees which takes away from any potential daylight and sunlight to occupiers of units within the lower floors of development. Aside from amenity concerns which are explored later in this report, it is considered that a wider buffer should be provided along this boundary in the interests of good design in terms of preventing the development from looking cramped on its site, creating an inviting and desirable space and the opportunity for a decent landscaping scheme to be provided as well as to enable future maintenance of the proposed development.
118. The layout of the proposed development, by reason of the size of the footprint of the two buildings also leaves insufficient room for appropriate landscaping to soften the appearance of the proposed development. The scale of the proposed development is considered to appear as a large unbroken and

impermeable building when approached along Great Stone Road which results in an unacceptable over-dominant visual impact on the surrounding area.

119. The layout of the site, combined with the height of the proposed development results in an overshadowing impact of the building on the internal landscaped courtyards. This is explored in more detail within the 'Amenity' section of this report, but is another indicator that the layout and scale of the proposed development is inappropriate.

Appearance

120. This planning application includes appearance as a matter to be determined as part of this outline planning application. Appearance is defined as the aspects of a building or place within the development which determine the visual impression the building or place makes, including the external built form of the development, its architecture, materials, decoration, lighting, colour and texture.
121. The character of the local area is varied but the submitted documentation does not provide a rationale on design cues or influences for the proposed development as one would expect, however the submitted Design and Access Statement explains that the elevational treatment has been designed to provide texture and depth to the elevation.
122. As noted previously there are concerns regarding the scale and massing of the proposed development. It is also considered that the form of the development, i.e. two large buildings, one 'L' shaped and one 'U' shaped on a site of this size is inappropriate in this context. The design approach is considered to be out of character with both the immediate context and that of the wider area (notwithstanding the presence of buildings of considerable scale within the wider area). Whilst a limited number of viewpoints have been included in the TVIA, those that have been taken in close proximity to the site, together with the cricket pitch views, demonstrate how incongruous this form of the development will be and how big it will look in close proximity to and in stark contrast with the two storey dwellings on both Great Stone Road and Trent Bridge Walk. The combined length, height and width of the buildings will appear larger than many of the stands at the cricket ground.
123. The front façade, in itself, although irregular in appearance, includes a number of set-backs at various points along the frontage, recessed windows details and sloping brick panels and integral balconies which create a depth to the façade and introduce some balance.
124. Additional information submitted illustrates the more detailed elements of the scheme such as the proposed balcony design, textured brick work detailing and terracotta baguette screen details. In terms of materials, the development proposes the use of a buff brick throughout the scheme, (although the prevailing character of the area is one typified by red brick buildings), including the detailed panels, with curtain walled glazing to the ground floor commercial units, warm grey aluminium framed windows and concrete string course, horizontal terracotta baguettes.

125. The same elevational treatment is carried through the remainder of the external facing elevations of the development, however fewer balconies are proposed on the rear and side elevations. The use of the same architectural approach to the external facing facades adds to the monotonous appearance of the building. There is no objection to a contemporary approach to the design in itself, and it is accepted that the proposed detailing will help, in a limited way to add interest to the external facing facades.
126. Basic courtyard elevations have been provided for review. The detailing shown on the courtyard elevations indicates that in comparison to the external elevations, which are more 'public facing' the level of detail proposed is minimal, with no indication of any relief or texture within the courtyard areas, unlike the external facades, which indicate shading, texture and depth. Due to the late submission of these details it has not been possible to secure further information, however on the basis of the information submitted, the proposed elevation treatment of the internal courtyards is considered to be inferior to that of the 'public facing' elevations and unacceptable.
127. Although the approach to the detail on some of the proposed external elevation treatments adds interest, it is the combination of the scale and appearance of the two buildings, particularly when viewed from the side and rear, and when both the length and width of the buildings can be seen together, that will dominate views around the area. In summary, it is considered that the proposed development will appear as a dominant and incongruous feature within the local and wider streetscene, which is detrimental to the overall character and townscape of both the immediate and wider area.

Density

128. The Local Plan does not seek to impose either minimum or maximum densities on proposed development however, the issue of density is referred to in Strategic Objective 1 of the Core Strategy which states that the Council will promote sufficient high quality housing in sustainable locations, of a size, density and tenure needed to meet the Borough's needs and to contribute towards those of the city region. Policy L1.4 states that the Council will seek to ensure the efficient use of land, concentrating higher density housing development in appropriate and sustainable locations where it can be demonstrated that it is consistent with the provisions of L2 (Meeting Housing Needs). These policies can be seen to encourage higher density development in appropriate locations and Policy L7.1 goes further to act as a 'sense check' and states that development should enhance the street scene or character of the area by appropriately addressing density, amongst other criteria.
129. The NPPF addresses the issue of density in paragraphs 122 and 123. Paragraph 123 states that "*Where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, it is especially important that planning policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site*" and at bullet point c) states "*local planning authorities should refuse applications which*

they consider fail to make efficient use of land, taking into account the policies in this Framework”.

130. Although the NPPF encourages the efficient use of land, paragraph 122 emphasises that development should also take into account the desirability of maintaining an area’s prevailing character and the importance of securing well designed, attractive and healthy places.
131. Throughout the NPPF there is an emphasis on good design, therefore it is clear that although higher density developments are encouraged within the NPPF, they should not be at such a high density as to be detrimental to the design of the development or at a density that is inappropriate to its location.
132. Although the GMSF is of limited weight in the determination of this application, Policy GM-H 4 is of relevance in terms of density. Increasing the average density of new housing developments in the most accessible locations is an important part of the overall strategy in the GMSF, it will help to ensure the most efficient use of the land, assist in the protection of greenfield land and maximise the number of people living in the most accessible locations. In Policy GM-H 4 this location is within the ‘Other rail stations with a frequent service and all other Metrolink stops’ category. This states that where sites are within 400 metres of these transport locations, the minimum net residential density should be 70 dwellings per hectare.
133. The density of the proposed development at 333 dwellings per hectare is considered to be inappropriate and excessive for the suburban location of this application site, particularly when the density of the immediately adjacent residential development is in the region of circa 30-40 dwellings per hectare and there is no relevant precedent in the surrounding area.

Conclusion on design and appearance

134. Good quality design is an integral part of sustainable development. The NPPF and PPG recognise that design quality matters and that the planning process should be used to drive up standards across all forms of development.
135. The proposed development at nine storeys in height with a density of 333 dwellings per hectare is considered to be significantly out of keeping with the general character and appearance of the local area in terms of scale, massing, appearance and density. There are no comparators within the vicinity of the application site and it is apparent in the representative views contained within the submitted TVIA that the proposed development would appear as an incongruous feature within the local and wider streetscene.
136. The layout of the site, in combination with the scale of the development also results in overshadowing of the internal courtyard amenity areas, which is considered to be a further indicator that the scale of the proposed development is not acceptable.
137. The front façade of the proposed development does deliver some positive features with the creation of an active frontage to Great Stone Road and an

interesting contemporary design approach which incorporates design features which help to break up the façade. However, it is not considered that this overcomes the harm caused by the scale, massing and form and appearance of the proposed development. This will be particularly evident when particularly when viewed from the rear and side elevations and when both the length and width of the buildings can be seen together.

138. Overall it is considered that the proposed development represents a poorly designed scheme and is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policy L7 and the NPPF, which at paragraph 130 indicates that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

HERITAGE

139. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the Local Planning Authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess and section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.
140. Policy R1 of the Core Strategy states that all new development must take account of surrounding building styles, landscapes and historic distinctiveness and that developers must demonstrate how their development will complement and enhance existing features of historic significance including their wider settings, in particular in relation to conservation areas, listed buildings and other identified heritage assets. This policy does not reflect case law or the tests of 'substantial' and 'less than substantial harm' in the NPPF. Thus, in respect of the determination of planning applications, Core Strategy Policy R1 is out of date and can be given limited weight.
141. Paragraph 193 of the NPPF establishes that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The NPPF sets out that harm can either be substantial or less than substantial and there will also be cases where development affects heritage assets but from which no harm arises. Significance is defined in the NPPF as the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest, which includes any archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic interest. The significance of a heritage asset also derives from an asset's setting, which is defined in the NPPF as 'the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced'.
142. The application site lies within the setting of Trafford Town Hall which is Grade II listed, Longford Park Conservation Area and Old Trafford Cricket Ground, which is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset.
143. Trafford Town Hall is significant for its aesthetic, historical illustrative and communal values. The clock tower in particular is an important local and

distinctive landmark and views of this contribute greatly to its aesthetic value. Its landmark quality orientates residents and visitors and provides a focal point within the locality. A clock face is intentionally visible on all four elevations of the tower emphasising the importance and visibility of this civic building at the time of construction in 1933 and this remains the case today. Currently there are glimpses of the clock tower from within and across the application site; these views therefore contribute to the significance of this Grade II listed building. It should be noted that Core Strategy Policy SL3 also references the requirement for new development to protect, preserve and enhance the listed Trafford Town Hall.

144. The proposed development will result in the loss of glimpses of the clock tower across the application site, however Viewpoint 1 of the LVIA does however indicate the most prominent view of the clock tower will be retained across the car park serving LCC. This harm is considered to be negligible.
145. The site will be visible from Longford Park Conservation Area. The significance of the Conservation Area derives from the site of the former Longford Hall and its association with John Rylands. During the 20th century, the Estate was designated as a public park and a key aesthetic value of the site comes from its green spaces, mature trees and planting. The layout of the spaces reflects both the park's historic estate use and changes made during its use as a park. The central and southern parts of the Conservation Area are defined by the estate buildings, formal gardens and tree lined paths, whereas the northern end of the park is much more open in character, with wide expanses of fields. In the 1930s a number of buildings and structures were added to the park including the former Firwood Library and entrance from the Quadrant to the north. The park, which is also highly valued as a recreational facility, provides vistas across to the open space to the north of the Conservation Area and beyond from the former Firwood Library towards the application site.
146. Despite the potential impact on the Longford Park Conservation Area identified in the submitted Heritage Statement, no viewpoints were included in the LVIA. An updated LVIA including an additional viewpoint from Longford Park was subsequently requested and provided. The submitted viewpoint demonstrated that the proposed development would result in a minor harm to the setting of Longford Park and the appreciation of the Conservation Area in views looking northwards across the open space. It is also considered that the proposed development may impact on the experience of the Park at night time which is a relatively dark space.
147. The Old Trafford Cricket Ground and pavilion are identified as a non-designated heritage asset. The pavilion was designed by Thomas Muirhead architect also of the pavilion at the Oval. Despite being altered and rebuilt after WWII bomb damage as well as a comprehensive redevelopment in recent years, the building maintains its original layout and relationship with the cricket pitch. The building remains an iconic image of LCC and has remained in its intended use since 1895, the circa 1920s turnstiles fronting Brian Statham Way are also of interest. The Cricket Ground is a recognisable and distinctive landmark and has considerable communal value for its contribution to the

sporting heritage of Old Trafford both locally and internationally. Similar to Trafford Town Hall, there are glimpses of the pavilion and cricket ground from Great Stone Road across and from within the application site.

148. The proposed development will result in the loss of glimpses of the pavilion and cricket ground, however this harm is considered to be negligible. Additional viewpoints from the Old Trafford cricket ground looking towards the proposed north eastern (rear) elevation were requested, however the applicant was unwilling to provide a formal viewpoint from within the cricket ground. As an alternative, views from within the cricket ground taken from the architect's model were provided. Although these aren't verified images they do indicate that there is potential for the development to cause negligible harm to the setting of Old Trafford Cricket Ground.
149. Paragraph 193 of the NPPF states that *"When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance."* Paragraph 194 of the NPPF requires *"Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset"* to be any harm to be justified in a clear and convincing manner. As stated in paragraph 190 of the NPPF, LPAs are required to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
150. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, paragraph 196 of the NPPF indicates that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The minor harm to the setting of Longford Park Conservation Area and the negligible harm to Trafford Town Hall therefore need to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal in accordance with paragraph 196 of the NPPF. Whilst the harm relates to setting, the balancing exercise should still take into account the statutory duty of Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 'to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas'.
151. As per paragraph 197 of the NPPF, *"the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset."* The harm to the Old Trafford cricket ground is in this instance considered to be negligible.
152. It is acknowledged that the proposed development would provide a number of public benefits, most notably 333 apartments on a vacant brownfield site in a sustainable location, and at a time when the Council cannot demonstrate a rolling five year housing land supply. This would represent a significant contribution to the Council's housing land supply figures and targets for delivering residential development on brownfield sites. The proposal would

provide 34 affordable homes, and is also likely to provide increased spending in the local area and a benefit to local shops. Considerable weight must therefore be given to these benefits, albeit that the scale of benefit in terms of housing numbers only arises as a direct result of the inappropriate design, height, scale, appearance and mass of the proposed building and the consequential harm identified here and elsewhere in this report. It is also noted that many of these benefits would also result from the provision of an alternative scheme that appropriately addressed these matters.

153. The harm caused to the significance of Longford Park Conservation Area as a result of the proposed development impacting on the setting of the designated heritage asset as a result of the design, excessive height, scale, mass and appearance of the proposed development, is such that the public benefits identified are not considered to outweigh this harm.
154. In relation to the consideration of the development proposal against paragraph 11d) of the NPPF, it is considered that the adverse impacts to designated heritage asset resulting from the scheme provide a clear reason for refusal of the application. The public benefits of the scheme are not considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm identified. The proposed development is also contrary to Core Strategy Policy R1. The impact on the non-designated heritage asset is weighed in the wider planning balance in the conclusion of this report.

AMENITY

155. In addition to ensuring that developments are designed to be visually attractive paragraph 127 of the NPPF advises that planning decisions should create places that provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.
156. Policy L7 of the Core Strategy contains similar requirements and requires development to be compatible with the surrounding area and not prejudice the amenity of future occupiers of the development and/or occupants of adjacent properties by reason of, amongst others, overbearing, overshadowing, overlooking, visual intrusion, noise and/or disturbance. It has already been concluded earlier in this report that L7 is considered to be up to date for decision making purposes and that full weight can be attached to it.
157. A range of issues have been considered under the broad topic of residential amenity in this case. All issues are considered in turn below, and with the impacts on both existing and prospective residents discussed.

Overlooking

158. An important consideration in seeking to deliver and maintain good standards of residential amenity is associated with avoiding adverse overlooking. This is ordinarily achieved by ensuring that an appropriate degree of separation exists, particularly between habitable room windows of facing properties, and also when bearing in mind the prospect for private amenity space to be overlooked.

159. The Council's New Residential Development Planning Guidelines document (PG1) does not include specific distance guidelines for tall buildings, other than stating that for development of four or more storeys where there would be major facing windows, flats should retain a minimum distance of 24m across public highways and 30m across private gardens. These guidelines were not written with high density developments in mind and carry limited weight in these circumstances.
160. Habitable room windows are located in all elevations of the proposed development with nearly all flats within the development having a single aspect outlook, with 151 residential units having either a north easterly or north westerly aspect.
161. The nearest existing residential properties are located opposite the site on Great Stone Road. The front façade of the proposed development is located between 34 metres and 42.7 metres from the front elevation of the existing residential dwellings on Great Stone Road. It should be noted that these dwellings are set at a lower ground level than Great Stone Road rising in height in front of these dwellings.
162. The application site is also located adjacent to the existing residential dwellings on Trent Bridge Walk which is located on the opposite side of the Metrolink line adjacent to the site. These dwellings are located between 38 metres and 44 metres away from the side elevation of the proposed development. The remaining external facing elevations will overlook the LCC ground and car parking area.
163. In terms of the internal layout, the courtyards achieve interface distances of 34 metres by 30 metres in the northern courtyard and 31 metres by 27.6 to 30 metres in the southern courtyard. Oblique views may be possible within the courtyard, however given the nature of the proposed development within a residential block and courtyard setting, this interface is considered to be acceptable.
164. The proposed development generally exceeds the separation distances set out within PG1 with the exception of the eastern end of the southern courtyard, if the separation distances across private gardens were applied. As noted before, PG1 was not written with high density developments in mind and this minor breach is considered to be acceptable and the internal relationships within the proposed development are considered to be acceptable.
165. The proposed development would also result in the introduction of a significant number of new habitable room windows and balconies overlooking the existing dwellings on Great Stone Road and Trent Bridge Walk. Whilst these residents are likely to feel overlooked as a result of this, particularly as these dwellings are not currently overlooked to their front elevations, the separation distances are considered to be acceptable and it is not considered that the proposed relationship would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking.

Overbearing impact

166. The need to ensure that the proposed development would not have an overbearing impact is a further, important residential amenity consideration. The term 'overbearing' is used to describe the impact of a building on its surroundings, and particularly a neighbouring property, in terms of its scale, massing and general dominating effect.
167. The existing situation of the dwellings located on Great Stone Road and Trent Bridge Walk must also be considered in assessing whether the proposed development would result in an overbearing impact to existing occupiers.
168. This proposal would introduce a building of significant height, scale and mass to the application site, which is not comparable to the scale of any development within the vicinity, which in itself is generally dominated by two storey residential dwellings.
169. Whilst SPD4 is not directly of relevance to a development of this nature as it focuses on residential alterations and extensions, it does advise on appropriate separation distances between developments to prevent an unacceptable overbearing impact. These are different to the privacy distances previously mentioned. Acknowledging the chief purpose of the SPD in informing householder planning applications, it recommends a distance of 15 metres between the principal elevation of one dwelling and a blank (i.e. no windows) elevation of another (assuming two-storey properties). For each additional storey, an additional three metres may be required, it continues.
170. The nearby two storey residential dwellings will be most impacted upon by the proposed development and an assessment has to be made to understand whether the proposed development would result in an unacceptable overbearing impact on existing residents on Trent Bridge Walk and Great Stone Road.
171. In assessing the proposed development against the criteria of SPD4 the proposed development would be expected to achieve separations distances between 21 and 36 metres as the site rises in height. The development achieves these distances.
172. However, whilst the proposed development meets the standards set out in SPD4, it must be acknowledged that SPD 4 was written for house extensions and is not readily applicable in this scenario. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed development by reason of its sheer scale and mass will form a significant block of development which would be readily visible from the windows, gardens and streets of the surrounding area.
173. The front façade has been broken up in to three blocks of development which allows views through the two courtyard access points, however the scale and massing of these blocks of development at 16, 33 and 33 metres in width will likely remain visible to occupiers of Great Stone Walk resulting in a dominating and overbearing effect.

174. The side elevation of the proposed development measures 68 metres in length is substantial in scale and massing at seven and nine storeys (20 and 26 metres) in height. It is considered that this elevation, with one step in height would result in an overbearing impact to the residents of Trent Bridge Walk.
175. Overall it is considered that the proposed development would introduce a dominant and intrusive feature which would appear overbearing to the surrounding area and would significantly affect existing views and appear completely at odds with the scale, form and character of the area.

Outlook

176. The issue of outlook is also a consideration in the determination of impact on amenity. A satisfactory outlook should be maintained for existing properties and ensured for future occupiers of the proposed development.
177. Occupiers of the flats located at ground and first floor level in the rear elevation of the proposed development would directly overlook a building which provides ancillary facilities to LCC and is located within the LCC ground. The building is industrial in design being clad in corrugated metal cladding. This building has an eaves height of approximately seven metres and is located approximately 12.5 metres away from the rear elevation of the proposed development where habitable room windows would be located.
178. A review of the level 0, level 1 floorplans and courtyard sections AA and BB indicates that fourteen flats with single aspect outlooks would directly face this unit and a further four units would also look onto this elevation.
179. The ground floor units would benefit from some landscaping to screen this with garden areas being provided to these units. The Level 0 site layout plan indicates that trees would be planted along this rear boundary, however the Landscape Design Statement contained conflicting information with the Level 0 plan at page 14 omitting any reference to trees on this boundary.
180. Clarification on this matter was sought, including a request for further information demonstrating the likely level of planting anticipated on this boundary. Although landscaping is a reserved matter the ability to appropriately landscape the rear boundary is important as this impacts on the outlook of the lower floor units as well as the general amenity of the site. There is concern that the amount of space potentially set aside for tree planting (0.5 metres) would provide very little room for tree planting which would provide any meaningful softening, nor would it allow room for trees to grow, flourish and mature within the bounds of the application site. The development is considered to be too close to this boundary.
181. Given the close proximity of the LCC building on the rear site boundary to the proposed development and the lack of room for site landscaping, this raises concerns that occupiers of these ground floor units are likely to have a poor outlook. It is also noted that these units are north-east facing and generally in

the shade throughout much of the day, naturally suffering from poor levels of daylight.

182. The proposed layout provides a separation distance of between 3.5 to 4 metres from the south eastern site boundary (Metrolink). TfGM have commented that Metrolink frequently receive complaints from residents where their property adjoins Metrolink land that has trees on it due to the shading from the trees. It is considered that the proximity of the side elevation to the south eastern boundary which is heavily landscaped with substantial trees within the TfGM Metrolink line ownership will result in a dark, shaded and poor outlook for occupiers of units in the lower floors of the southern block adjacent to the Metrolink line.

Daylight and Sunlight

183. With specific regard to amenity in terms of daylight and sunlight paragraph 123 c) of the NPPF states that where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, it is important that planning policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site, the NPPF goes on to state that local planning authorities should take a flexible approach in applying policies or guidance relating to daylight and sunlight, where they would otherwise inhibit making efficient use of a site (as long as the resulting scheme would provide acceptable living standards).
184. As previously noted Policy L7 also seeks to ensure that development must not prejudice the amenity of future occupiers of the proposed development and existing occupiers of adjacent properties.
185. New residential development should also be designed to ensure that adequate levels of natural light can be achieved. With this in mind, the application is accompanied by a specialist study which has sought to establish the extent of any sunlight and daylight loss on surrounding properties, and whether any overshadowing would occur and the level of daylight and sunlight serving the units within of the proposed development. For the sake of clarity, daylight is defined as the volume of natural light that enters a building to provide satisfactory illumination of internal accommodation between sunrise and sunset. Sunlight refers to direct sunshine, and overshadowing is a consequence of the loss of sunlight.
186. The report is based on the methodologies set out in the Building Research Establishment (BRE) report 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight - A guide to good practice'.
187. The report focuses on the nearest sensitive receptors, listed below. These 35 residential properties are located in the immediate vicinity of the site. No commercial receptors have been considered by this report.
- No.s 9-21 Trent Bridge Walk (all inclusive)
 - No.s 47-61 Gorse Crescent (odd no.s only)

- No.s 44 – 50 Great Stone Road (even no.s only)
 - No.s 54 – 58 Great Stone Road (even no.s only)
 - No. 55 Great Stone Road
 - No. 1 - 4 Gorse Avenue (all inclusive)
 - No.s 6 & 8 Gorse Avenue
188. The report also assesses the impact of the proposed development on future occupiers to establish whether a satisfactory level of daylight would be received internally.
189. The report refers to three measures of diffuse daylight: Vertical Sky Component (VSC), No-Sky Line (NSL) and Average Daylight Factor (ADF). Sunlight is measured as Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH). Each of these is explored in further detail below.
190. The VSC method measures the amount of sky that can be seen from the centre of an existing window and compares it to the amount of sky that would still be capable of being seen from that same position following the erection of a new building. The measurements assess the amount of sky that can be seen converting it into a percentage. *If the VSC within new development is :*
- *At least 27%, conventional window design will usually give reasonable results;*
 - *Between 15% and 27%, special measures such as larger windows and changes to room layout are usually needed to provide adequate daylight;*
 - *Between 5% and 15%, it is very difficult to provide adequate daylight unless very large windows are used;*
 - *Less than 5%, it is often impossible to achieve reasonable daylight, even if the whole window wall is glazed.*
191. When assessing the VSC of existing developments, if the VSC, with the new development in place, is less than 27% and less than 0.8 times its former value, occupants of the existing building will notice the reduction in the amount of skylight. The area lit by the window is likely to appear gloomier and electric lighting will be needed more of the time. It should be noted that the 27% VSC target value is derived from a low density suburban housing model.
192. NSL is a measure of daylight distribution within an existing building/room. The NSL divides points on the working plane which can and cannot see the sky. In housing, the working plane is assumed to be horizontal and 0.85 metres above the floor. If from a point in a room on the working plane it is possible to see some sky then that point will lie inside the NSL contour. Conversely, if no sky is visible from that point then it would lie outside the contour. As areas beyond the NSL receive no direct daylight, they usually look dark and gloomy compared with the rest of the room, however bright it is outside. Supplementary electric lighting will be needed if a significant part of the working plane lies beyond the NSL.

193. When comparing the NSL for existing buildings against that proposed following development, BRE guidelines state that if the no-sky line moves so that the area of the existing room which does receive direct skylight is reduced to less than 0.8 times its former value, then this will be noticeable to the occupants, and more of the room will appear poorly lit from those that cannot.
194. Average daylight factor (ADF) is a measure of the overall amount of daylight provision in new rooms. The BRE guidelines advise that the acceptable minimum ADF target value depends on the room use and advises an ADF of 1% for a bedroom, 1.5% for a living room and 2% for kitchens. It should be noted that the BRE guidance advises that an ADF of 5% would provide a well daylit space and 2% would provide a partly daylit space, where electric lighting is likely to be turned on.
195. Annual Probability of Sunlight Hours is a measure of sunlight that a given window may expect over a year period. BRE guidance recommends that at least one main window wall should face within 90 degrees of due south and the APSH received at a given window in the proposed development should be at least 25% of the total available, including at least 5% in winter.
196. BRE guidance notes that a dwelling with no main window wall within 90 degrees of due south is likely to be perceived as insufficiently lit. In large residential developments the number of dwellings whose living rooms face solely north, north east or north west should be minimised, unless there is some compensating factor such as an appealing view to the north,
197. When assessing the impact of APSH in existing developments, if a living room of an existing dwelling has a main window facing within 90 degree of due south, and any part of a new development subtends an angle of more than 25 degrees to the horizontal measured from the centre of the window, then the sunlighting of the existing dwelling may be adversely affected. This will be the case if the centre of the window fails to meet the criteria outlined above and received less than 0.8 times its former sunlight hours during either period and has a reduction in sunlight received over the whole year greater than 4% of APSH.

Daylight and sunlight impact on existing properties

198. Existing properties should be assessed against the BRE guidelines for VSC, NSL and ASPH.
199. Of the 35 properties assessed, 100% are compliant in terms of VSC and APSH.
200. Six of the properties assessed fail to meet BRE criteria on NSL, which has a target of attaining 80% of their former value. Two of the properties which fail to meet these guidelines do so minimally and achieve a NSL reduction of between 72% and 78%. The remaining four properties which fail to meet the BRE NSL target values fail by a more significant degree:

DWELLING	NSL
----------	-----

	LIT AREA EXISTING	LIT AREA PROPOSED	REDUCTION
14 Trent Bridge Walk (B8)	98%	70%	72%
13 Trent Bridge Walk (B9)	100%	77%	78%
58 Great Stone Road (B22)	97% 98%	49% 77%	50% 78%
56 Great Stone Road (B23)	98% 97%	59% 46%	60% 47%
55 Great Stone Road (B25)	99% 97%	62% 38%	62% 39%
54 Great Stone Road (B24)	98% 96%	55% 66%	56% 69%

Table 1

201. The windows affected by the reduction in NSL are all bedrooms. The applicant's Daylight and Sunlight Assessment concludes that where there are deviations from the BRE guidelines, the significance of the deviations are offset by the following factors:

- i. *It is inevitable when constructing buildings in an urban environment that alterations in daylight and sunlight to adjoining properties can occur*
- ii. *Deviations from the BRE guidelines are generally very minor/marginal and good levels of natural light are retained by most properties/windows when taking into account the existing environment*
- iii. *The BRE guide states that "bedrooms should be analysed although they are less important" and the majority of rooms that experience any impact are bedrooms*
- iv. *The BRE guidelines indicate that in interpreting the results of an assessment, a degree of flexibility is required, especially in a dense urban environment where neighbouring properties are located within narrow streetscapes and with design obstructions restricting the availability of daylight or sunlight*
- v. *The new NPPF 2018 [now 2019] states that "a flexible approach should be taken in applying policies relating to daylight and sunlight, where they would otherwise inhibit making efficient use of a site"*
- vi. *The BRE tests are based on a typical (two storey) suburban model of development and it is reasonable to assume that expectations of levels of daylight sunlight will be different in developing larger properties such as this. This is noted in the guide itself.*

Conclusion on daylight / sunlight impact on existing properties

202. The Local Planning Authority acknowledges that some flexibility should be applied in the consideration of daylight and sunlight as set out in paragraph 123 of the NPPF in order to facilitate the delivery of higher density developments.

However, it should be borne in mind that this application site is located within (and impacts upon) a low density suburban area and not an urban environment as implied within the submitted assessment, therefore it is considered that the proposed development should generally comply with the figures set out in BRE guidance.

203. The impact of the proposed development is such that it fails to comply with the relevant BRE daylight criteria standards in relation to four existing properties on Great Stone Road and two existing properties on Trent Bridge Walk.
204. Whilst it is acknowledged that the affected windows solely serve bedrooms, the degree of non-compliance is nonetheless concerning and a number of properties will have to rely more on electric lighting to achieve adequate internal lighting levels. This is considered to be an unacceptable impact on residential amenity, caused by the height, scale, massing and layout of the proposed development, particularly when the outlook from the ground floor level of these units is already compromised by the retaining structure of Great Stone Road as it forms the bridge over the Metrolink line.

Daylight and sunlight impacts on proposed units

205. Residential units within proposed developments should be assessed against the BRE guidelines for VSC, ADF and ASPH.
206. As with existing developments a VSC of 27% should be achieved for the proposed units. The applicant's study shows that:
- 192 out of 513 windows assessed have a VSC of greater than 27% and pass the BRE guidelines.
 - A further 122 windows have a VSC marginally below the required level.
 - 34 of the remaining 82 windows have a VSC value that is considered to be minor adverse.
 - 27 of the remaining 48 windows (5%) have a VSC value that is considered to be moderate adverse.
 - 21 windows (4%) have a VSC value that is considered to be major adverse.
 - 117 windows aren't fully accounted for in the results section of the applicant's report assessment and are simply noted as serving "*bedrooms which the guide states are less important than other habitable rooms*".
207. The analysis within the applicant's Daylight and Sunlight Report only assesses those windows that did not pass the general rule of thumb, meaning all other windows in the development do by definition pass the BRE tests and a further 599 windows in the development pass the BRE target VSC value of 27%.
208. The applicant's assessment concludes that "*1064 of the 1112 windows (96%) therefore either fully pass the BRE guidelines, serve bedrooms which are deemed to be less important by the BRE guide or are negligibly or a minor amount below the required level.*"

209. Further analysis of the appendices to the submitted Daylight Sunlight Report indicates development will achieve the following VSC levels:

Floor	No. of windows meeting VSC guidance	No. of windows with VSC 17% - 27%	No. of windows VSC 5% - 16%
0	0/65	37/65	28/65
1	3/72	53/65	16/72
2	19/92	64/92	9/92
3	31/92	56/92	5/92
4	53/86	32/86	1/86
5	45/59	14/59	
6	32/36	4/36	
7	10/11	1/11	

210. Although the figure of 27% is based upon a low density suburban model and some flexibility should be applied, BRE guidance states that where VSC figures are between 5% and 15% it is very difficult to provide adequate daylight unless very large windows are used and where less than 5% it is often impossible to achieve reasonable daylight levels.
211. Average Daylight Factor (ADF) is also considered within the submitted Daylight Sunlight Report. The ADF for 319 out of 428 rooms assessed exceed the minimum BRE guideline requirement. There are 790 rooms in total throughout the proposed development.
212. The ADF levels to the remaining 109 rooms were assessed with 57 being negligibly below the target value. 10 rooms were shown to suffer from a minor adverse impact, 8 rooms would suffer from a moderate adverse impact and 10 rooms would suffer from a major adverse impact. The ADF of 24 bedrooms not included in these figures were not fully analysed in the conclusion of the report, again on the basis that they are 'less important than other habitable rooms'.
213. The ADF recommendations are minimum values which should be achieved to provide an adequately daylit room. This proposed development would not achieve the minimum recommended ADF values for 109 rooms (14%), where electric lighting would have to be more heavily relied on to light rooms. An analysis shows that dwellings on most floors (ground to fifth floor) will be affected by poor ADF levels, however the vast majority affected are located on the ground, first and second floors of development.
214. In terms of APSH, 258 of the 513 windows assessed did not fall within 90 degrees of due south and were not assessed for APSH.
215. Where measured, the APSH calculations to 253 of the 255 remaining windows are well above the BRE recommended levels of 25% in *summer*. The remaining two windows are less than 20% below the BRE recommended levels of 25% in summer and are considered have a negligible adverse impact within the applicant's report.

216. Where measured, the annual probable sunlight hours calculations to 243 of the 255 windows are well above the BRE recommended levels of 5% in *winter*. Nine of the remaining 12 windows serve bedrooms which the BRE guide states are less important than other habitable rooms. The annual probable sunlight hours calculated to 2 of the remaining 3 windows (1%) are less than 20% below the BRE recommended levels of 5% in winter and are considered have a negligible adverse impact within the applicant's report.

Conclusion on daylight / sunlight for the proposed units

217. From an analysis of the data contained within the submitted report it is clear that residents of the units on the lower floors of the proposed development, in particular the first to fifth floors would be subject to daylight and sunlight levels which are below the BRE guidance recommended values set out for VSC and ADF. Whilst each impact on its own may not be considered to be an issue, when taken collectively, it is considered by the Local Planning Authority that a considerable number of the residents of the proposed development, would not benefit from an adequate level of daylight or sunlight and this would be detrimental to their residential amenity. In summary, it is considered that these issues are a result of the inappropriate form, layout, height and scale of the proposed development.

Wind Microclimate

218. A Wind Microclimate Report was submitted in support of the planning application. The report assesses the effect of the proposed development on the local microclimate against best practice guidelines for pedestrian comfort and safety. These two aspects are associated with pedestrian use of public open spaces.
219. Wind environment is defined as the wind flow experienced by people and the subsequent influence it has on their activities. It is concerned primarily with wind characteristics at pedestrian level.
220. The report assessed a number of receptors within and surrounding the proposed development, including within the LCC ground and around the nearby dwellings on Great Stone Road and Trent Bridge Walk.
221. A baseline scenario model was produced to ascertain the existing conditions on the site before the proposed development was modelled. This baseline model identified some zones at the surrounding areas where wind speeds tend to accelerate, particularly in the winter months such as to the south-west and south-east of the Site along Great Stone Road. These areas are generally considered to be suitable for standing and sitting and therefore suitable for the existing uses.
222. The proposed development scenario was then modelled and the pedestrian comfort and safety assessed.
223. The comfort assessment indicates:

- At the street level during Summer, the results show that the wind environment of the Site and its surroundings remains largely suitable for sitting and standing, indicating relatively calm wind conditions.
- The results indicate an area of wind acceleration to the south of the Site (Receptor 57) with wind conditions suitable for “leisure walking”.
- At terrace level the results indicate that, during Summer, on the accessible terraces (amenity spaces) the wind environment is largely suitable for “sitting” indicating relatively calm wind conditions. There are some localised areas of seasonal wind acceleration to the south part of the terrace and to the north-west and south-east corners of the terrace, indicating conditions suitable for “standing”.
- At the balconies levels during Summer, the results show that the wind environment is largely suitable for “sitting” and in some for “standing” indicating generally calm wind conditions and suitable for the intended uses.
- The Summer wind comfort conditions at all accessible terrace levels is considered suitable for the intended uses, provided that the seating arrangements will be allocated within the areas suitable for “sitting”. As, the remaining roof terraces are not accessible to people other than qualified maintenance personnel no mitigation measures are recommended.

224. In terms of pedestrian safety the assessment indicates:

- At street level, the results indicate that, within the Site and its close proximity, the recommended criteria for safety is not exceeded and the area is safe for all pedestrians.
- At the terrace and balconies levels, the results indicate that the recommended criteria for safety are not exceeded at all levels accessible to the occupants and therefore no mitigation is required.
- As, the remaining roof terraces are not accessible to people other than qualified maintenance personnel and therefore no mitigation measures are recommended.

225. The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of impact on the local microclimate and the microclimate which would result within the proposed development.

Amenity Space

226. PG1: New Residential Development sets out the Council’s standards and states that most new dwellings should provide some private outdoor space and that this is necessary for a variety of functional requirements such as sitting out and children’s play. The guidance sets out recommended garden area sizes and advises that for flats, 18 m² of adequately screened communal area is generally sufficient for these functional requirements, with balconies counting towards this area of amenity provision.

227. In line with the standards set out in PG1, this development should provide 5,994m² of communal amenity space. However it is acknowledged that these standards should be applied flexibly.

228. The proposed development provides a total of 5,329m² amenity space through the provision of 3,549 m² of communal roof terraces and 1,002 m² of private terraced areas, largely at ground floor level where 36 units are proposed to have private amenity areas.
229. The balconies are generally located on the outward facing external facades of the development with most balconies proposed on the north eastern and north western elevations. Few balconies are provided on the internal courtyard elevations. Generally the balconies are small in size, measuring between 4 and 6.5 m², although there are some exceptions to this with some balconies at fifth, sixth and seventh floor measuring up to 23 m². Although the majority of private balconies provided are small, they do provide enough space for a small table and chairs to be placed outside and an area for residents to sit.
230. The proposed site layout provides two internal courtyard areas which are overlooked by all units which face onto these courtyard areas. The internal separation distances within the northern courtyard measuring 34 metres by 30 metres and the southern courtyard measuring 31 metres by 27 to 30 metres, which as previously covered within the report ensures a reasonable separation distance between apartments or balconies.
231. A sunlight study was provided within the Landscape Design Statement. During the course of the application an additional Sunlight Study and set of CGI videos looking at March to October from 9am to 8pm were provided in response to the Sport England comments. The sunlight studies show the impact of the proposed development at 08:00, 09:00, 12:00, 15:00 and 18:00 hours on 22 March, 22 June and 22 September and 22 December.
232. Clarification was raised in relation to the two sunlight studies as they both indicate slightly different impacts, although taken at face value they do indicate that the courtyards will be shaded for much of the year throughout most times of day, with perhaps the exception of June.
233. The submitted videos provide additional information and demonstrate in further details the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of future residents and the surrounding area in terms of daylight and sunlight.
234. The BRE guidelines advise that for external amenity areas to appear adequately sunlit throughout the year, at least half of an amenity area should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March.
235. A review of this information indicates that with the exception of May, June and July, the development will be shaded for considerable parts of the day, particularly the courtyards and northern elevations of the central and southern blocks of development, although the areas of shade do of course move throughout the day.
236. The roof top gardens by their nature will benefit from sunlight all year around and are considered to be an acceptable form of amenity space. The

Landscape Design Statement indicates that levels five and seven of the roof top terrace areas will create *“intimate spaces through the use of raised planters and pergolas. Planters will support shrubs and perennials, offering year round interest with vibrant colours through the summer months. Moveable cube seating and large wooden loungers offer soft and informal seating areas. Contemporary pergolas create sheltered eating and social areas. Decking is used with bands of flag paving to create contrasting surfaces to the terrace floor.”* Levels six and eight would provide larger spaces and the LDS proposes *“The west terrace houses a large open grassed area, which acts as a flexible space for all kinds of recreation. The central terrace creates more divided and private interconnected spaces with moveable cube seating, pergolas and large wooden loungers. Raised planters are used carefully to create intimate and sheltered spaces for outdoor recreation. The east terrace offers raised planters for resident growing areas, where people can use the comfortable and relaxing areas for use all year round.”*

237. Overall, it is considered that the amount of amenity space provided is acceptable, however there are concerns that the quality of the space provided within the internal courtyards will be poor due to a lack of sunlight. Nonetheless there is sufficient private amenity space provided within the roof top garden areas for residents to access and it is considered that the level of amenity space provided on site is acceptable.
238. The quality of the proposed amenity space is considered in greater detail in the ‘Trees and Landscaping’ section, although the details of landscaping are not included for consideration in the determination of this outline application.

Noise and Disturbance

239. An Acoustic Design Statement, Vibration Assessment and Plant Noise Limits Report was submitted with the application. The application site is located adjacent to Great Stone Road and the Metrolink which are the predominant noise sources which would affect occupiers of the proposed development. The site is also located adjacent to LCC which would be a noise source with regard to cricket matches and occasional concert events. The adjacent Metrolink line is also a potential source of disturbance in terms of vibration.
240. The Acoustic Design Statement (ADS) includes the results of a monitoring exercise to establish noise levels affecting the site from local traffic and the adjacent Metrolink line. An assessment of the results has confirmed that any impacts on the new occupiers of the development should not be significant, subject to the use of double glazing and acoustically rated trickle vents, which can be conditioned.
241. The external amenity areas were also assessed and this has found that some roof terraces are likely to be affected by environmental noise that exceeds the recommended criteria of guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings. However there is sufficient provision for outdoor recreation within the courtyard areas where noise levels would be compliant with the aforementioned recommendations across the majority of the space.

242. The impact of crowd noise and announcements from cricket matches and concert events from the adjacent LCC was also assessed. No significant impacts have been found that warrant special consideration.
243. With regard to concert events the license agreement for this venue permits a maximum of seven outdoor concert events per annum, although typically only one or two events tend to be held per annum. Premise License conditions also ensure that events of this nature are subject to a curfew of 10.30pm. The ADS proposes to address the potential for any inconvenience brought about by such events through a noise management plan (NMP) for the development, with details to be confirmed but likely to take the form of a building management strategy providing early warning of concert dates to residents so that they are fully informed.
244. Overall the impact of noise on proposed residents is considered acceptable and the majority of noise impacts can be overcome through the use of acoustically rated trickle vents and adequate sound insulation from the building fabric. This can be conditioned if planning permission were to be granted.
245. With regard to occasional noise from concert events, residents would be aware, by virtue of the site's location and as part of their tenancy agreement that noisy events will occur and the proposed Framework Management Plan will ensure relevant information is distributed appropriately. This approach is considered to be acceptable to address this issue.
246. A vibration assessment was also undertaken which assessed the adjacent Metrolink line, upon which trams run between 05:24 and 23:48 Monday to Thursday and 05:24 to 00:48 on Fridays and Saturdays and 06:29 to 23:48 on Sundays and bank holidays (based on a 2018 timetable). The impact of vibration levels from the Metrolink line have been found to be insignificant.
247. TfGM have requested that a condition is attached requiring the proposed development to be acoustically insulated against noise and vibration from the tramline, should planning permission be granted.
248. Fixed plant would be required as part of the proposed development and it is currently proposed that this is located in the basement plant room, however detailed plant specification is not available at this stage of the design for consideration. If planning permission were to be granted it is considered appropriate for a condition to be attached requiring details of any fixed plant to be submitted to the LPA for approval.
249. Should planning permission be granted, a range of conditions would also be required to ensure the proposed commercial uses do not detrimentally impact on the amenity of future and existing residents. These would need to relate to timings for servicing, opening hours and extraction equipment details should food and drink uses occupy any of the commercial units.

250. In order to protect general amenity a range of conditions would also be required in relation to lighting and construction management plans
251. It is not considered that occupiers of the proposed development would suffer from poor amenity as a result of noise or vibration, with the exception of occasional events at LCC, however tenants would be aware prior to moving in of this possibility.

Conclusion on amenity

252. The NPPF and Policy L7 of the Core Strategy requires development to provide places where high levels of amenity for future and existing residents are provided. The assessment of this scheme demonstrates that the proposed development would not provide a satisfactory level of amenity for a significant proportion of future residents of the proposed development.
253. Overall it is considered that the proposal would introduce a dominant and intrusive form of development which would appear overbearing to existing residents in the surrounding area, significantly affecting existing views and appearing completely at odds with the streetscene and character of the area.
254. The proposed development would result in a poor outlook for prospective residents of the lower floors on the south eastern and north eastern elevations due to the proximity of the proposed development to the heavily landscaped Metrolink line and the ancillary LCC building.
255. It has been established that the proposed development would have an overbearing and dominating effect on surrounding residential properties and the area in general. The amenity of existing and future residents in terms of daylight and sunlight also causes serious concern. The proposed development would in particular detrimentally impact on the NSL measurement to the extent that occupiers of existing properties on Trent Bridge Walk and Great Stone Road would have to rely more on electric lighting to achieve adequate internal lighting levels. Residents of the proposed development, particularly those at the lower floor levels would also suffer from substandard daylight and sunlight levels which are below the BRE guidance, which when assessed collectively is considered to result in an environment where occupiers would suffer from inadequate levels of daylight or sunlight which would be detrimental to their residential amenity. Officers have borne in mind the requirement for a flexible approach in applying policies or guidance relating to daylight and sunlight.
256. It is considered the quantum of amenity space provided in the proposed development, through the internal courtyards, balconies, private and communal terraces is sufficient to address the needs of residents. The detail and proposed quality of landscaping is considered in further detail later in this report.
257. The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of noise, disturbance, subject to conditions securing further details. Overall, it is

considered that the proposed development fails to comply with Core Strategy Policy L7 and paragraph 127 f) of the NPPF.

AIR QUALITY

258. The existing and proposed entrance to the site lies within the GM Combined Authority Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) (2016), however the remainder of the application site lies outside of the AQMA.
259. Paragraph 181 of the NPPF advises that planning decisions should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones, and the cumulative impacts from individual sites in local areas. Planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones is consistent with the local air quality action plan.
260. Paragraph 110 of the NPPF also requires applications for development to be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.
261. The Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) has published a joint Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) (2016-2021) which seeks to improve air quality across Greater Manchester and to embed low-emission behaviours into the culture of our organisations and lifestyles by 2025, whilst supporting the UK Government in meeting all EU thresholds for key air pollutants at the earliest date to reduce ill-health in Greater Manchester. In managing new development the GMCA AQAP sets out a number of controls. Of relevance to this particular application are assessment of local air quality impacts from the proposed development; construction management; encouraging travel planning; and, green infrastructure.
262. Policy L5 requires developers to adopt measures identified in the Greater Manchester Air Quality Action Plan, to ensure that their development would not have an adverse impact on the air quality. In this respect, L5 can be considered to be up to date for the purposes of decision making and full weight attributed to it.
263. An addendum to the Air Quality Assessment (AQA) submitted in support of the previous application on this site (94974/OUT/20) has been submitted in relation to this application. The previous AQA and its conclusion that the scale of development would not create an adverse impact on local air quality was considered to be acceptable during the determination of 94974/OUT/20.
264. The addendum to the original AQA concludes that due to the reduction in the level of car parking associated with the new site layout and the reported reduction in the background annual levels of nitrogen dioxide levels at this location the findings of the original report remain valid and there will be no adverse impacts on local air quality. The Council's Pollution and Licensing team are in agreement with this conclusion.

265. If planning permission were to be granted a condition would be recommended to secure the submission of a Construction Management Plan prior to commencement of the development, which would include details of dust management measures during the demolition and construction phases of the development and waste handling and disposal measures, amongst others to minimise any potential amenity issues.
266. The Pollution & Housing Team have requested that electric vehicle (EV) charge points (minimum 7 kWh) are provided within the development. As this application proposes the provision of unallocated car parking spaces for a limited number of tenants, one charge point per ten car parking spaces would be required. The provision of ten charging points would therefore be required to serve the residential scheme. For commercial developments, one charge point per 1,000 m² of commercial floorspace should be provided. The non-residential uses on site would generate a requirement for one charging point to be provided, bringing the total required across the site to eleven. The submission does not specifically mention the inclusion of EV charging points, however it is considered that this requirement could be adequately addresses through the imposition of condition, should permission be granted.
267. A Framework Travel Plan has been produced which encourages the use of sustainable travel options. The proposed development itself provides 98 car parking spaces for 333 residential units, which will also encourage the use of sustainable travel options for future residents.
268. Overall it is considered that the proposed development is acceptable in terms of air quality impacts and the proposed development would contribute to the aims of the Greater Manchester AQAP. The proposed development is therefore considered to comply with the aims of the NPPF and Policy L5 in this respect.

LAND CONTAMINATION

269. A Phase 1 Environmental Risk Assessment was submitted in support of the proposed development. The report identified that the site may have been affected by localised contamination associated with commercial uses on the. The Phase 1 report recommended that a Phase 2 Intrusive Assessment is completed to obtain further geotechnical and geo environmental information to ensure that the site is suitable for a residential and commercial usage and does not present a risk to the local environment. The submission of this report could be secured via condition should planning permission be granted. The proposed development is considered to comply with Policy L7 in this respect.

HIGHWAY MATTERS

270. Policy L4 of the Core Strategy states that “when considering proposals for new development that individually or cumulatively will have a material impact on the functioning of the Strategic Road Network and the Primary and Local Highway Authority Network, the Council will seek to ensure that the safety and free flow

of traffic is not prejudiced or compromised by that development in a significant adverse way”.

271. Paragraph 109 of the NPPF states that “Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe”. Given the more stringent test for the residual cumulative impacts on the road network set by the NPPF, it is considered that the elements of Core Strategy Policy L4 which relate to impacts of a development on the road network should be considered to be out of date for the purposes of decision making, whereas those elements that relate to maximum parking standards and consideration of highway safety remain largely up to date.

Trip Generation

272. TfGM has raised concerns regarding the Great Stone Road / Talbot Road junction assessment within the Transport Assessment. Although further information has been provided by the applicant, TfGM continues to raise concern over the information provided. Additional information has since been received and passed to TfGM, an update on this issue will be provided in an additional information report if possible.
273. It is noted that the LHA have reviewed the original data and consider the anomalies in the information presented to be so minor they are immaterial and have no further comments on this issue.

Accessibility and Public Transport

274. Policy L4 of the Core Strategy states that the Council will prioritise the location of development within the most sustainable areas accessible by a choice of modes of transport. The site is within a highly sustainable and accessible location given its proximity to the Old Trafford Metrolink stop, bus services and cycle infrastructure. The site is within walking distance of Old Trafford Metrolink stop (within a 10 minute walk) providing frequent services between Altrincham, Manchester and Bury). Trafford Bar is located within a 20 minute walk from the application site and provides additional links to the whole tram network providing links to Manchester Airport, Eccles, Bury, Rochdale Town Centre and Ashton-under-Lyne.
275. The nearest bus stops are located on Great Stone Road, Talbot Road, Kings Road and Chester Road. Metrolink services will likely be the most utilised giving future residents’ access to a choice of travel mode which should help to reduce the amount of car travel otherwise generated by this development. There are also nearby services, amenities and employment opportunities available which will make walking and cycling genuine alternatives to travelling by car or public transport. Trip Generation and Traffic Impact.
276. The application is accompanied by a Framework Travel Plan which represents a long term strategy for reducing the dependence of residents on travel by private car to and from the site. The Transport Assessment Addendum v3

outlines modal share targets, which the LHA has confirmed as acceptable. The developer has also stated that a Travel Plan Coordinator would be appointed one month prior to the first occupation, which would promote sustainable travel modes from the outset. Future residents will therefore have access to a choice of travel mode which should help to reduce the amount of car travel otherwise generated by this development.

277. If planning permission were to be granted a condition requiring the submission of a full Residential Travel plan would be required.

Site Access

278. Core Strategy Policy L7 requires development to incorporate satisfactory vehicular access and egress points. Vehicular access to the proposed development would be via the existing access from Great Stone Road, which provides a suitable visibility splay of 2.4 x 43 metres. The Local Highway Authority has confirmed that the use of this existing vehicular access is acceptable.
279. The proposed pedestrian and cycle access arrangements in to the site are considered acceptable in terms of highways.
280. However, the LHA seek a developer contribution of £30,000 towards works to improve pedestrian and cycle accessibility to the three un-signalled arms of the Great Stone Road / Talbot Road junction.

Car and cycle parking

281. The Council's car parking standards for this location are 1 space for 1 bedroom dwellings and 2 spaces for 2 to 3 bedroom dwellings, which results in a maximum requirement for 556 spaces based on the proposed number and mix of units. The proposed level of car parking at 98 spaces is significantly below this maximum standard. The 98 car parking spaces includes three accessible spaces for residents, three accessible spaces for the retail units and three car parking spaces for visitors to the retail units.
282. The car parking spaces will be allocated on a permit basis and these would be issued on a first come first served basis.
283. The applicant has considered car ownership levels across the ward using 2011 Census data as suggested in the SPD3 and this data indicates that across the ward 59% of people living in apartments do not own a motor vehicle. It is anticipated that the development would attract younger residents and the cohort of adults who are less than 30 has seen a marked reduction in car ownership, holding a licence and travelling less by car. The Transport Assessment (TA) Addendum v3 also notes that as this cohort gets older the effects continue compared with their peers.
284. The LHA have advised that a greater understanding of whether nearby parking is available to residents must be considered by the applicant and that such an

understanding is fundamental to a shortfall in parking provision being acceptable. The LHA would therefore require both a Car Park Management Plan for the car parking spaces proposed and a Parking Survey Strategy identifying areas that may be susceptible to on-street parking issues within a 1 km walking distance of the proposed development. An initial survey would be required prior to occupation of the development to identify existing levels of on-street parking. Subsequent surveys would be undertaken should three or more separate complaints that can be reasonably linked to the development site be made to Trafford Council within any single six month period. These surveys could be required at any point from first occupation to a point two years after the point at which the development has been completed and the whole development available for let. The surveys would need to be undertaken within six months of the third complaint being received for that zone (subject to neutral traffic conditions). Following the results of any subsequent parking occupancy surveys, it may be appropriate for TROs to be amended/provided in any affected zone should it be proven that the parking complaint is reasonably linked to the proposed development. It would only be appropriate that the applicant covers the full cost of the surveys and any necessary subsequent amendments to the TROs.

285. In support of the proposed reduced level of on-site parking it is also acknowledged that the site is located in a sustainable location as the site is within walking distance of both Old Trafford and Trafford Bar Metrolink stops.
286. With regard to car parking to serve the commercial units, the six allocated parking bays will be signed so that there is a time limit of 1-hour parking during the day, 0900-1800 Monday-Saturday. This can operate on a pay and display arrangement where visitors will need to display a ticket or via an ANPR linked registration method operated at the commercial unit/reception. The remainder of the time they will be available for permit holding residents to use. The LHA is satisfied with the parking permit system as proposed and would recommend that car park management plan be secured through a condition.
287. The car parking standards set out, that as a minimum, for A1, A3, D1 and D2 uses the greater of the either three parking bays or 6% of the total capacity (six in this instance) shall be provided as accessible car parking spaces. Residential provision is to be provided on a case by case basis. The scheme proposes the provision of six accessible car parking spaces in total with three accessible parking spaces provided permanently for residents and three for use by the proposed commercial units between the hours of 0900 – 1800. Although the provision of six accessible spaces is policy compliant, it is considered that the allocation between the proposed residential and commercial units is not proportionate and amendments are required on this point. The parking spaces are also not ideally located within the car park so as to provide easy access to the lifts, and so the layout would need to be revised to make this acceptable.
288. The Council's standards require one cycle space per dwelling where communal cycle parking is proposed, which results in a requirement for 333 cycle spaces to be provided. The scheme proposes the provision of 400 secure, indoor cycle

spaces within two cycle stores, one within the car park and one at ground level in the southern block of development for residential uses.

289. Due to the flexible nature of the proposed commercial units, cycle parking needs to be based on the greatest requirement as cycle parking standards are minimum standards, which would equate to 1 cycle space per 50 sq m. This result in a requirement for seven cycle parking spaces to be provided. No cycle parking is proposed on the floorplans however, the TA Addendum v2 notes that there is scope to provide 3 x Sheffield Stands or similar and that this could be conditioned. Four Sheffield stands would be required to provide a policy compliant level of cycle parking and it is considered that there is sufficient space in the public realm landscaping scheme to accommodate this level of provision and it is agreed that this could be satisfactorily addressed via condition in the event that the appeal is allowed.
290. The submitted parking layout doesn't indicate any motorcycle parking spaces, however there is scope within the car park to provide a number of spaces for residents. The commercial units also need to provide a minimum number of motorcycle parking spaces. As per the cycle parking spaces due to the flexible nature of the proposed commercial units, the number of motorcycle parking needs to be based on the greatest requirement, which in this instance is one motor cycle space per 125 sq m of floorspace. This results in a requirement for three motorcycle spaces to be provided for use by the commercial units. Although these spaces are not indicated on the submitted plans, it is considered that they could be secured via condition in the event that the appeal is allowed.

Conclusion

291. The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of access, trip generation and overall accessibility in terms proximity to public transport options. The proposed level of residential car and cycle parking is also considered to be policy compliant.
292. It is considered that due to the increase in pedestrian and cycle movements to and from the site, infrastructure improvements are required to the Talbot Road / Great Stone Road junction. A financial contribution of £30,000 would be required to contribute towards a safe pedestrian and cycle environment for the development. The applicant's agent has confirmed that they are willing to provide a contribution of £30,000 towards highways improvements.
293. The proposed development is considered to comply with requirements of Core Strategy Core Strategy Policies L4, L7 and SPD 3.

SPORT ENGLAND

294. Old Trafford Place Objective OTO11 seeks to maximise potential of Lancashire Cricket Club (LCC) as a visitor attraction and its potential to lead major regeneration in the area. Place Objective OTO11 supports Policy SL3 which

- seeks to provide an improved stadium at LCC with ancillary sports and leisure facilities.
295. Policy R5 seeks to ensure that where necessary the Council will secure the provision and maintenance of a range of sizes of good quality, accessible, play, sport, leisure, informal recreation and open space facilities to ensure that appropriate facilities are available to meet the needs of its residents across the whole of Trafford.
296. Policy R5.4 in particular states that development which does not preserve the quality of open space, sport or recreation facilities, will not be permitted.
297. Sport England, who are a statutory consultee, have objected to the proposed development on three grounds, with the support of the English Cricket Board (ECB) as technical advisors:
- i. The proposed development will prejudice the use of the adjacent fine turf and non-turf training facility, due to the massing of the proposed development and the impact of the development on the sun path. It is noted that this facility was recently redeveloped at a cost of over £500k and services the elite professional squads (men's/women's and international) alongside the wider cricketing community.
 - ii. The impact of the proposed development on the access to the ground from Great Stone Road.
 - iii. The proposed use conflicts with the aims of the Draft CQ AAP and LCC's Master Plan, which seeks "to create outstanding sporting facilities with enhanced community engagement and superior transport links through opening out the site access Old Trafford tram stop and constructing a new leisure centre including wet and dry sport offers and an elite cricket training facility with community access."
298. Following these initial comments from Sport England, further information has been provided by the applicant in relation to point (i) (paragraph 297) in the form of a snapshot sunlight analysis which provided an analysis of the impact of the proposed development upon these facilities at 06:00, 09:00, 12:00, 15:00 and 18:00 on the 22nd of March, June, September and December.
299. In reaction to the submission of this information, Sport England advised that the analysis provides a snap shot at various times of the year and times of the day and shows that there will be some overshadowing of varying degrees throughout the year. This shadowing has two distinct prejudicial impacts:
- a) The current snap shot analysis shows that in September it will cause a contrast between the batters and bowlers making the ball difficult to see.
 - b) During periods of time when the facility is not played the shadowing will affect the maintenance of the fine turf. Fine turf cricket surfaces use grasses unsuited to shading. Without external support (for example from Stadium Grow Lighting which is expensive to purchase and run) the facility may suffer qualitative issues that also affect capacity and usage.
300. Following this review a 365 day animation was requested to show the impact and help inform any mitigation required. Further information in the form of CGI videos, demonstrating the impact of the development on the surrounding area

between the hours of 09:00 and 20:00 from March to October were subsequently submitted.

301. An analysis of this information has not allayed the concerns raised and the ECB advice via Sport England that *“there will be a serious negative effect on the facility during winter. Fine turf grasses can be highly susceptible to disease if shaded during low growth periods and this could set the whole facility at risk. Mitigation for these issues can be achieved through stadium growth lights but they are expensive to both purchase and run, and further contribute to the carbon footprint of any turf area.”*
302. With regard to point ii) at paragraph 297, further clarification was sought on this point from Sport England as the fall-back position of the existing use has to be taken into account and it is likely that access to the proposed development will generate fewer vehicle movements than the retail use. Sport England confirmed that the previous operators of the site had a risk mitigation strategy agreed with LCC for site management measures on match days and possibly on training days, although this was agreed outside of the planning process. It is considered this point could be addressed via condition, should an appeal be allowed.
303. With regard to point iii), although the Draft CQAAP outlines the aspirations of Trafford Council, it is of limited weight in the determination of this planning application to its Draft status. The LCC Masterplan is also not a material planning consideration in the determination of this planning application.
304. To prejudice the training facilities at LCC which were recently redeveloped at a cost of over £500k and service the elite professional squads (men’s/women’s and international) alongside the wider cricketing community is not considered to be acceptable and would conflict with the aims of policies SL3 and R5 which seek to protect these facilities.

LANCASHIRE CRICKET CLUB

305. LCC is an internationally important sports venue which makes an important contribution to the character and identity of Trafford and the cultural heritage of the area. As well as LCC’s importance in terms of its sporting history and cultural importance, the site is also a tourist destination which attracts a large number of visitors from within and outside the Borough. Place Objective OTO 11 seeks to maximise the potential of LCC as a visitor attraction whilst Policy R6 recognises the importance of tourist destinations such as LCC and seeks to protect and enhance the culture and tourism offer in the Borough. Policy SL3.1 sets out the vision for the wider Lancashire Cricket Club Quarter Strategic Location and states that *“a major mixed-use development will be delivered in this Location to provide a high quality experience for visitors balanced with a new, high quality residential neighbourhood centred around an improved stadium at Lancashire County Cricket Club”*.
306. The proposed development will be highly visible from within and outside the cricket ground not only to spectators within the site but also to viewers watching

cricket matches on TV. It is considered that the scale, height and massing of the proposed development would adversely impact on views from within and outside the ground, an international tourist attraction, to the detriment of visitors' experience of the ground and the wider Strategic Location. It is therefore considered that the proposed development fails to uphold Place Objective OTO 11 and Core Strategy Policies SL3 and R6.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

307. Bin stores are proposed within the basement car parking area of the development, with the submitted plans indicating that the stores will accommodate 63 bins. The bin stores would be maintained by on-site staff and servicing would occur from the within the basement car park where bin 'drop areas' are indicated on the basement floor plan.
308. The proposed level of bin storage facilities is considered to be acceptable and the proposed development is to comply with Core Strategy Policy L7 in this respect.

FLOODING AND DRAINAGE

309. The NPPF sets strict tests in order to protect people and property from flooding, which all local planning authorities are expected to follow. In summary these tests are designed to ensure that if there are better sites in terms of flood risk, or if a proposed development cannot be made safe from the risks of flooding, then it should not be permitted. A similar approach is embodied in Core Strategy Policy L5 (and thus this aspect of Policy L5 is also up-to-date for the purpose of decision-taking). The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 and is thus categorised as having the lowest probability of river or sea flooding. The site also sits within a Critical Drainage Area as defined by the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).
310. The submitted Drainage Strategy assessed a number of options for surface water disposal, however the discharge of surface water to a public sewer is concluded to be to be the only appropriate option. Attenuation tanks are proposed to restrict the flow of surface water drainage.
311. The Local Lead Flood Authority have reviewed the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy and have recommended that should permission be granted, a condition is recommended in the event that the appeal is allowed requiring a scheme to improve the existing surface water drainage system based on the details within the Flood Risk Assessment to be submitted as well as a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.
312. Having regard to flood risk and drainage matters, the development is considered to be acceptable and compliant with Core Strategy Policy L5 and the NPPF.

TREES AND LANDSCAPING

313. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment was submitted in support of the proposed development. 19 individual trees, four groups of trees and one hedge were recorded within influencing distance of the site. The surveyed trees are primarily located outside the site boundary, except those on the south-eastern boundary and the occasional young self-seeded tree. None of the trees surveyed were classified as being Category A (high value), eight trees were classified as Category B (moderate value) and a further eight trees were classified as Category C (low value). Seven trees were classified as Category U (unsuitable for retention). One single Leyland cypress hedge on the north eastern boundary was also recorded but this was not assigned a quality category.
314. Notable trees within the site comprise planted individuals on the south east boundary at the edge of the existing car park hard surfacing, adjacent to the Metrolink link. These trees were likely planted as part of the area's original landscaping and are made up of a range of species. Tree condition varies but the group contains several trees that have been subject to mechanical damage which has instigated overall deterioration. Three trees along the south eastern elevation are in reasonable condition with good form.
315. Fourteen individual trees and three tree groups and approximately 17.5 metres of hedgerow would be removed to facilitate the proposed development. Of these however, eight are in poor condition and would be recommended for removal irrespective of development to remove the risk of future failure onto high value targets, these trees are located along the north eastern and south eastern boundaries.
316. TfGM Metrolink have raised concerns in relation to the Root Protection Area (RPA) of some of the trees on the Metrolink boundary and whether they may be detrimentally impacted upon by the proposed development, which in turn could impact slope stability. TfGM have however advised that [if the appeal were to be allowed] they subject to further information being secured by condition in relation to the trees concerned, work method statements and landscaping details these concerns could be mitigated through agreed works.
317. Landscaping is not included within this outline application for consideration at this stage and is a 'reserved matter'. A Landscape Design Statement (LDS) has been submitted in support of the proposed development, which suggests landscaping and planting along the embankments adjacent to Great Stone Road. The LDS indicates some landscaping along the south eastern boundary adjacent to the small private garden areas. Due to the layout of the site and proximity of the proposed development to the site boundaries, in particular the south eastern site boundary, it is not considered that the proposed site layout allows for sufficient space to accommodate a satisfactory landscaping scheme which would adequately soften and screen the development. There are also serious concerns that, because of the extent of the footprint of the buildings, insufficient space is set aside on the north eastern and north western boundaries to accommodate a sufficient level of landscaping, including tree planting with appropriate species on land within the applicant's control, to both soften and allow this development to be appropriately assimilated into its

environment, whilst ensuring that tree canopies remain reasonable distance from habitable room windows.

318. Should the appeal be allowed, as part of any reserved matters submission a detailed landscape plan, tree protection plan and method statement for all proposed works within tree protection areas would be required.
319. There are no arboricultural objections to the proposals as the majority of the higher quality trees are proposed for retention, following the removal of the suppressed and poor quality specimens. Replacement trees should be provided within a robust landscaping scheme but as expressed in the previous paragraph, there isn't considered to be sufficient room available on the site for this to be delivered. The proposed development is therefore considered to comply with Policy R2 in this regard.

ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY

320. Core Strategy Policy R2 seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity of sites and their surroundings and protect the natural environment throughout the construction process. Policy R2 of the Core Strategy is considered to be compliant with the NPPF and therefore up to date as it comprises the local expression of the NPPF's emphasis on protecting and enhancing landscapes, habitats and biodiversity. Accordingly, full weight can be attached to it in the decision making process.
321. Section 15 of the NPPF requires planning decisions to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. Specifically paragraph 175 d) of the NPPF requires developments to take opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments.
322. An Ecological Assessment was submitted in support of the proposed development. This survey was considered to be acceptable and surveyed the habitats on site and assessed their suitability to support protected species of principal importance.
323. The survey was conducted in February which is recognised as suboptimal for the majority of surveys. However, the Report is an update of an earlier survey. In addition, given the nature and size of the proposal this is not considered to be a constraint on the assessment and does not invalidate its findings. The Report concluded that the site supports a building of negligible value to bat roosting, and the surrounding habitats within the site are of only local and in part limited value to biodiversity. All other protected species have been reasonably discounted.
324. The Ecological Assessment makes recommendations in respect of biodiversity enhancement as guided by the NPPF and it is recommended that bat boxes, green trellising, seed mix for green roof terrace and use of bug hotels are also used. Should the appeal be allowed, it is also recommended that any future landscape and planting scheme submitted under condition also incorporates the details of the biodiversity enhancements.

325. The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of impacts on ecology and biodiversity and compliant with policy R2 in this regard, subject to a condition, should the appeal be allowed, securing the measures outlined in report recommendations within the scheme.

CARBON BUDGET

326. Core Strategy Policy L5 requires applicants to demonstrate how they have sought to minimise their contribution towards and / or mitigate their effects on climate change. It is considered that Policies L5.1 to L5.11, which addresses the issue of carbon emissions, are out of date as they do not reflect NPPF guidance on climate change.

327. With regard to climate change and carbon emissions the NPPF states that new development should be planned for in ways that: a) avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change. When new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, including through the planning of green infrastructure; and b) can help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as through its location, orientation and design. Any local requirements for the sustainability of buildings should reflect the Government's policy for national technical standards.

328. A Carbon Budget Statement (CBS) was submitted in support of this application, which details that the development design will focus on promoting a 'fabric first' approach to reduce the demand for heat and power through a well-insulated, energy efficient building fabric and services and the provision of energy efficient measures (services) within the development, such as:

- 100% high efficiency low energy lighting;
- A full suite of heating controls to allow occupants to efficiently use their heating system;
- Energy efficient mechanical ventilation systems with heat recovery; and
- Where appropriate, specification of high energy efficient rated appliances that use less energy and water;
- The use of electric panel heaters will be utilised to provide space heating and efficient electric cylinders will provide hot water to each apartment. This will be supported by the use of mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR) to provide fresh air whilst reusing the majority of heat from the dwellings that would otherwise be lost.

329. Whilst Core Strategy Policy L5 is out of date, this policy requires development to achieve a 5% improvement over the 2013 Building Regulations, when located outside a Low Carbon Growth Area, such as this application. The report outlines that the development is aiming to achieve a 6.2% reduction in CO₂ emissions, over Part L 2013 through the use of active and passive energy efficiency measures, to 421.78 tonnes per annum, which equates to a 27.88 T CO₂ saving.

330. In addition to the above measures, generating low carbon energy on site can reduce reliance on fossil fuels, minimises energy lost through transmission, contribute to security of supply and better connections between energy demand and generation.
331. A renewables options assessment is provided in the CBS, which states that if further reduction in emissions are desired, then photovoltaic Solar Panels would be the most suitable solution on site due to the electrical heating dependence. The overall energy fuel use here is electrical and so electrical saving/generation renewables will be more applicable and best suited thus discounting and rendering not applicable all Biomass / CHP and gas fired technologies.
332. No information regarding the installation of PV solar panels has been included within the scheme, however the proposed development would achieve a policy compliant level of CO₂ reduction without the incorporation of PV solar panels at 6.2% over the 2013 Building Regulation standards and would comply with Policy L5 and the NPPF in this respect.

CRIME PREVENTION AND SECURITY MEASURES

333. The NPPF advises at paragraph 127 that planning decisions should create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience. A Crime Impact Statement was submitted as part the planning application submission, which assesses the scheme with regard to layout, physical security measures, landscaping, lighting and CCTV and advises on crime prevention methods which should be incorporated into the development.
334. The scheme has been reviewed by Greater Manchester Police who have advised that a condition requiring the physical security specifications set out in the submitted Crime Impact Statement should be implemented as part of the development. The proposed development is therefore considered to comply with the Core Strategy Policy L7.4.

IMPACT UPON LOCAL SERVICES

335. New development often creates new demands on local infrastructure, and the NPPF also recognises that it is right that developers are required to mitigate this impact. Core Strategy Policy L2 identifies that all new development should be appropriately located in terms of access to existing community facilities and/or it would deliver complementary improvements to the social infrastructure (including schools and health facilities) to ensure the sustainability of a development. Core Strategy Policy SL3 states that in order for development in this Strategic Location to be acceptable the provision of ancillary community facilities may be required. This would include the provision of health and education facilities. Revised SPD 1 also indicates that the provision of healthcare facilities may be required in the vicinity of Strategic Locations.

336. Trafford Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) have commented on the proposed development and advised that the population yield of the proposed development could be incorporated into existing local health centres without detrimentally impacting on local services.
337. Policy SL3 of the Core Strategy also states that in order for development in this Location to be acceptable a contribution may be required towards increasing the intake of the existing Old Trafford Primary School and the provision of a new 1- form primary school to serve the new residential community in this and the Trafford Wharfside Strategic Location.
338. A consultation with the School Admissions team advised that the proposed development would generate 47 primary school pupils and 33 secondary school pupils.
339. A review of available secondary school places in the vicinity of this application site illustrates that there is a surplus of spaces at Lostock High School, Stretford High School and St Antony's RC High School, although the latter two schools do not have a permanent surplus capacity. Stretford High School is also noted to be oversubscribed in the lower year groups. Lostock High School however has a permanent surplus of 285. Permanent surplus is the sum of the number of places available in all year groups.
340. A review of primary school places however demonstrates that no schools have a permanent surplus and the level of current vacancies is there is low with only St Hilda's CE (VA) Academy having any vacancies and potential for expansion. Given the current situation with primary school places, it is considered necessary for developer contributions to be sought towards primary education facilities. The contribution required to mitigate the impact of the proposed development is £641,973.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

341. This proposal is subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). In terms of residential development the site is located in the 'cold zone', consequently apartments will be liable to a CIL charge rate of £0 per square metre, in line with Trafford's CIL charging schedule and revised SPD1: Planning Obligations (2014).
342. This proposal also includes development under the following categories 'public/institutional facilities', 'office', 'leisure' and 'all other' development. This application seeks permission for these Use Classes to be flexible and it is not known at this stage what uses would occupy which unit. These non-residential elements (348 m²) of the proposed development are liable for CIL and the following charge rate would be applied in line with Trafford's CIL charging schedule and revised SPD1: Planning Obligations (2014):
 Public/institutional facilities – £0 per square metre
 Offices – £0 per square metre

Leisure – £10 per square metre
 All other development – £0 per square metre

343. As the application seeks a flexible use for the commercial units, it is possible that all of the commercial floorspace could be used for leisure purposes, therefore all of the commercial floorspace would be subject to the leisure CIL rate of £10 per square metre.

SPD1: Planning Obligations

344. This supplementary document sets out Trafford Council's approach to seeking planning obligations for the provision of infrastructure, environmental improvements and affordable housing required in relation to new development. Contributions sought through SPD1 will be through the established mechanism of a Section 106 agreement.
345. Affordable Housing – as outlined in paragraphs 37 to 39, it is considered that the appropriate level of affordable housing required to serve the proposed development should be determined through the submission of a Financial Viability Appraisal, and that the level of provision should not normally exceed 40%. The applicant proposes the provision of 10% affordable housing on site. It is not considered that the submitted viability appraisal demonstrates unequivocally that the proposed development cannot deliver more than 10% affordable housing. If there is any change in this position it will be updated in an additional information report.
346. Education - policy L2.2 states that residential development will be appropriately located in terms of access to existing community facilities and/or delivers complementary improvements to schools. Policy SL3 states that in order for development in the Strategic Location to be acceptable, community facilities, including schools, should be provided.
347. Based on the Department for Education's 2021-22 rate per place, the calculation provided by Trafford Education shows that the expected primary pupil yield of the development would equate to a contribution of £641,973. It is noted that Lostock School has sufficient permanent vacancies to accommodate the secondary yield of the proposed development, therefore a secondary contribution will not be required in this instance. The applicant has advised that they are not in a position to confirm whether they will provide this developer contribution. If there is any change in this position it will be updated in an additional information report.
348. Health – Policy L2.2 states that residential development will be appropriately located in terms of access to existing community facilities and/or delivers complementary improvements to health facilities. Policy SL3 states that in order for development in the Strategic Location to be acceptable community facilities including health facilities, should be provided.
349. Trafford CCG have been consulted and have confirmed that the population generated by the proposed development can be accommodated into the existing health facilities within the vicinity of the application site. Consequently

no developer contribution is required to mitigate the impact of the proposed development.

350. Specific Green Infrastructure – This section of the SPD relates to appropriate tree planting and other forms of Green Infrastructure that would be appropriate to mitigate the impact of the development. The SPD advises what level of green infrastructure provision is required within developments. Tree planting is the predominant form of Green Infrastructure provision on development sites and is achieved through an appropriate landscape planning condition as the Council prefers to achieve planting on development sites, the SPD outlines that one tree per residential apartment should be provided. The provision of alternative green infrastructure treatments can also be provided in lieu of, or in combination with tree provision. Of relevance to a scheme of this nature, other Green Infrastructure that could be provided includes 5m of preferably native species hedge, per two apartment, and/or green roof/ green wall provided at 1/10th of the area of the building footprint.
351. Although landscaping is a reserved matter it is clear that 333 trees could not be provided on site. The development does however provide circa 780 m² of green roof space in addition to 3,549 m² as part of the roof terrace landscaping scheme. The footprint of the proposed development is circa 3578 m². The level of green roofspace offered would therefore meet the green infrastructure requirement set out in SPD 1.
352. Spatial Green Infrastructure – Spatial green infrastructure is the open and natural green space function of GI associated with the needs of residents of the development and includes Local Open Space and Semi Natural Green Space. Core Strategy Policy L8 states that the Council will seek contributions towards Spatial Green Infrastructure, such as parks, play areas and outdoor sports facilities. SPD1 accepts that if a sufficient level of local open space cannot be provided on site, off-site improvements to nearby open space can be made by way of a financial contribution.
353. Local Open Space should be provided on site and a development of this size would be expected to provide an on-site local equipped area of play (LEAP) with a minimum size of 400m² and 'buffer zone' of 3,600 m². Clearly the proposed development site would not be able to accommodate the proposed LEAP and a developer contribution is required in this instance. Based on the proposed mix of 333 apartments, £252,837 would be required as a commuted sum towards facilities at Longford Park. The applicant has confirmed that they are willing to provide a developer contributions of £252,837 towards spatial green infrastructure.
354. SPD1 states that that very large developments (300 units and above) will also be required to provide mitigation measures for semi-natural greenspace. It has however been confirmed by the Council's Strategic Planning and Growth that no contribution towards semi-natural greenspace is required as there is sufficient semi natural greenspace sites within 3km of the development site.

355. Sports Facilities – SPD1 states that very large developments in the region of over 300 units will need to provide on-site facilities, in line with the standards in Policy R5 and the deficiencies and needs identified as part of the Outdoor Sports Assessment of Need Study, and/or in line with the deficiencies and needs identified as part of any future needs assessments. The proposed development exceeds this threshold for on-site sports facilities to be provided. The SPD also states that in exceptional circumstances it may be more appropriate to pay a commuted sum towards the provision of outdoor sports facilities and provides the example of where large development is phased so the provision can be delivered as part of a later phase, or provide the required provision on land outside of the boundary for planning permission but close to the development. It is considered this development site would be subject to a commuted sum for outdoor sports facilities.

356. Based on Sport England's Assessment of outdoor sports provision and information contained within the Council's adopted Playing Pitch Strategy the following contribution has been calculated:-

Outdoor sport provision - £121,110 (pitch provision/improvement cost of £107,153 and associated lifecycle cost of £13,957).

357. The contribution would be used to make improvements to local grass and artificial pitch facilities to increase capacity and address highlighted issues and priorities in the adopted Playing Pitch Strategy and Local Football Facilities Plan. Recipient sites for improvements would include one or all of the following identified sites: St Bride's Fields (Old Trafford); Seymour Park pitches (Old Trafford) and Turn Moss Playing Fields (Stretford) within the North (Old Trafford/Stretford) study area. The applicant has confirmed that they are willing to provide a developer contributions of £121,110 towards outdoor sports provision.

358. Transport and Highways - the LHA have identified that due to the increase in pedestrian and cycle movements to and from the site, infrastructure improvements are required to the Talbot Road / Great Stone Road junction. A financial contribution of £30,000 would be required to contribute towards a safe pedestrian and cycle environment for the development. The applicant has confirmed that they are willing to provide a developer contributions of £30,000 towards highways.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

359. S38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF at Paragraphs 2 and 47 reinforces this requirement and at Paragraph 12 states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as a starting point for decision making, and that where a planning application conflicts with an **up to date** (emphasis added) development plan, permission should not normally be granted.

360. The NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions, and as the Government's expression of planning policy and how this should be applied, it should be given significant weight in the decision making process. As the Council does not have a five year supply of housing land, the tilted balance in Paragraph 11 of the NPPF is engaged. An assessment of the scheme against Paragraph 11(d)(i) identifies that there is a clear reason for refusal on heritage grounds as set out in the weighted balancing exercise carried out in the 'Heritage' section.
361. Nevertheless, as the tilted balance in Paragraph 11 of the NPPF is triggered in respect of other primary issues considered, and so it is necessary to carry out an assessment of whether the adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits to establish whether any additional reasons for refusal are justified and appropriate.

Benefits of the Scheme

362. The main benefits that would be delivered by the proposed development are considered to be:
- The delivery of 333 new homes on a brownfield site in a highly sustainable location. The proposals would contribute significantly towards addressing the identified housing land supply shortfall.
 - The provision of a mix of units that will provide a range of new homes for families and smaller households which are considered appropriate for this Strategic Location.
 - 10 per cent of the total number of dwellings will be delivered as affordable units on site, albeit it is considered that the applicant has not demonstrated that the scheme couldn't support a greater number of units.
 - Financial contribution towards off-site improvements to open space and facilities for children/young people, outdoor sports and highways improvements.
 - The construction phase is estimated by the applicant to generate 186.6 person years of temporary construction employment, and create a Gross Value Added to the local economy of approximately £11.4 million.
 - The gross additional household expenditure generated by the new residential population at the proposed development site will be around £8.5 million per annum.
 - New Homes Bonus.

Adverse Impacts

363. The following adverse impacts associated with the proposed development have been identified:
- Significant harm to the character and appearance of the area by reason of a poor and contextually inappropriate design response including the layout, form, height, density, scale and massing of the development.

- Overbearing and dominating effect on surrounding residential properties and the area in general.
- Poor outlook for a number of future residents who would directly overlook a building which provides ancillary facilities to LCC at a separation distance of 12.5 metres.
- Unacceptable living standards for future occupiers of the development, by reason of inadequate daylight and outlook in apartments and sunlight to the internal courtyard amenity areas.
- Harm to the amenity of existing residential properties on Great Stone Road and Trent Bridge Walk by reason of noticeable reductions in the amount of daylight that they receive.
- Minor harm to the setting of the Longford Park Conservation Area.
- Negligible harm to the setting of Trafford Town Hall, a Grade II listed building.
- Negligible harm to the setting of the Pavilion at Lancashire Cricket Club, a non-designated heritage asset.
- Significant harm to the interest and importance of Lancashire Cricket Club as a cultural and tourist attraction.
- Failure to demonstrate a development plan policy compliant level of planning obligations in relation to affordable housing.
- Failure to provide a development plan policy compliant level of planning obligations in relation to education provision.
- Prejudicial to the use of the fine turf and non-turf training facility at Lancashire Cricket Club.

Conclusion

363. The main benefits of the scheme are the number of residential units that the scheme would deliver on a brownfield site in what is a highly sustainable location, to which substantial weight is given. The scheme will deliver a range of new homes for families and smaller households, 34 of which would be affordable. Less weight is given to the provision of affordable housing than might otherwise have been the case had the applicant adequately demonstrated through the Financial Viability Appraisal the amount of affordable housing which could be provided. There are also contributions offered in respect of open space, outdoor sport provision and highway improvements, which are required to mitigate the proposed development and thus have a neutral effect in the balancing exercise. The other main benefits arising from the scheme relate to the employment benefit of the construction process and the increased spending power the development will bring to the area. It is also acknowledged that the proposed scheme is considered to be acceptable in a number of respects, subject to appropriate mitigation, such as those relating to highways, noise and vibration, air quality, land contamination, waste management, flood risk, ecology and biodiversity, specific green infrastructure, and crime prevention.
364. Whilst weight is apportioned to these benefits as described, it is considered that they are nevertheless significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the adverse impacts of the scheme. The application site sits within the Lancashire

Cricket Club Strategic Location, one of the most visited places in the Borough, with the cricket club itself a longstanding international sporting attraction. Policy SL3 seeks to deliver a major mixed use development to provide a high quality experience for visitors balanced with a new high quality residential neighbourhood centred around an improved stadium at the cricket club. This vision is currently in the process of being taken to the next level through the Civic Quarter Area Action Plan, albeit this document is only at Regulation 18 stage and so can carry limited weight in the consideration of this planning application. Nonetheless the document illustrates the place and design aspirations that SL 3 seeks to deliver in this location. The development is considered to be wholly inappropriate with regard to its context, layout, form, height, density, scale and massing, and will result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, to which substantial weight is given. Great weight is also attached to the harm identified to the designated heritage assets, specifically Longford Park Conservation Area and Trafford Town Hall. The development will result in an overbearing and dominating effect on surrounding residential properties and the area in general, and also adversely impacting on sunlight and daylight for both existing and prospective residents, to which substantial weight is attached. Significant weight is also attached to the harm that will result to the setting and interest of Lancashire Cricket Club as an important cultural and tourist attraction which sits at the heart of the Strategic Location. Moderate weight is also given to the harm to the setting of the Pavilion at Lancashire Cricket Club as a non-designated heritage asset. Significant weight is also afforded to the failure to provide a policy compliant level of affordable housing and education provision contributions.

365. The adverse impacts of the scheme mean the development cannot be considered to be a sustainable form of development. Many of the benefits of the scheme could equally be delivered from a scheme that was more sensitively designed and which offered a higher level of affordable housing provision and an appropriate contribution towards education provision.
366. The report has identified that the proposed development will result in a significant number of harmful impacts, and assessed as a whole the proposed development is considered to conflict with a number of Core Strategy policies including L2, L7, SL3, R1, and the thrust of policies R6 and OTO 11. It is therefore considered to be contrary to the development plan. Moreover, albeit it can carry only limited weight at this juncture, the proposed development runs contrary to the aims and objectives of the Draft Civic Quarter Area Action Plan and the type and quality of place that it seeks to deliver.
367. A clear reason for refusal has been identified in relation to heritage matters under paragraph 11 (d)(i) and having carried out the weighted balancing exercise under Paragraph 11 (d)(ii) of the NPPF, it is considered that the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of doing so. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

1. The proposed development would prejudice the use of the fine turf and non-turf training facility at Lancashire Cricket Club. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Strategic Objective OTO11, Policies SL3 and R6 of the adopted Core Strategy.
2. The proposed development would have a dominating and adverse impact on Lancashire Cricket Club (LCC) as well as its setting and cultural character and identity. LCC is an internationally significant visitor attraction, cultural and tourism venue. The impact on the visitor experience is considered to be sufficient to weigh strongly against the proposal. The development is therefore contrary to Policies SL3 and R6 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The proposed development would represent poor design as its form, layout, height, scale, massing, density and monolithic appearance are inappropriate in its context and would result in a building which would be significantly out of character with its surroundings. This would have a highly detrimental impact on the street scene and the character and quality of the area. This would be contrary to Policies SL3 and L7 of the adopted Trafford Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework
4. The proposed development would not provide a development plan policy compliant level of planning obligations in relation to affordable housing and education improvements to suitably and appropriately mitigate the impacts of the development. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that there is a robust viability case to demonstrate that the scheme could not offer a policy compliant level of obligations. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies SL3, L2 and L8 of the adopted Core Strategy and the Council's adopted Revised Supplementary Planning Document 1 (SPD1) - Planning Obligations and the National Planning Policy Framework.
5. The proposed development by virtue of its height, massing, scale and layout would result in a poor level of amenity and unacceptable living standards for future occupiers of the development, by virtue of inadequate daylight and outlook in both apartments and amenity areas. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies SL3 and L7 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
6. The proposed development by virtue of its height, massing, scale and layout would result in harm to the amenity of existing residential properties on Great Stone Road and Trent Bridge Walk by virtue of noticeable reductions in the amount of daylight and sunlight that they receive, and would also have an overbearing impact on these properties and other residential properties in the wider 'Gorses' area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies SL3, L3 and L7 and the National Planning Policy Framework
7. The proposed development by virtue of its layout, scale and massing would have a harmful impact on the setting of Longford Park Conservation Area equating to 'less than substantial' harm in National Planning Policy Framework terms. The benefits of the scheme are not considered to

outweigh the identified harm to a designated heritage asset. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies SL3 and R1 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.