

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 15<sup>th</sup> October 20**

**ADDENDUM TO THE AGENDA:**

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT (INCLUDING SPEAKERS)**

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This report summarises information received since the Agenda was compiled including, as appropriate, suggested amendments to recommendations in the light of that information. It also lists those people wishing to address the Committee.
- 1.2 Where the Council has received a request to address the Committee, the applications concerned will be considered first in the order indicated in the table below. The remaining applications will then be considered in the order shown on the original agenda unless indicated by the Chair.

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

**REVISED ORDER OF AGENDA (SPEAKERS)**

Part 1 Applications for Planning Permission					
Application	Site Address/Location of Development	Ward	Page	Speakers	
				Against	For
<a href="#">100270</a>	Land Bound By Elsinore Road And Skerton Road, Stretford M16 0WF	Longford	1	✓ Cllr Duffield Cllr Jarman	✓
<a href="#">100835</a>	165A Marsland Road, Sale M33 3WE	Brooklands	91	✓	
<a href="#">101019</a>	4 Woodlands, Davyhulme M41 7AA	Davyhulme East	109	✓	✓
<a href="#">101192</a>	26 Grangethorpe Road, Urmston, M41 9HT	Urmston	122		
<a href="#">101371</a>	39 - 42 Ingleby Court, Stretford M32 8PY	Longford	130	Statement only	
<a href="#">101460</a>	1 Lichfield Road, Davyhulme M41 0RU	Davyhulme East	143		✓
<a href="#">101467</a>	321 Moorside Road, Flixton M41 5PA	Flixton	154		✓ Cllr S. Procter

## ITEM 6 – Planning Obligations: Developer Contributions towards the Carrington Relief Road

### Representations

Officers are aware that Friends of Carrington Moss (FoCM) and Carrington Parish Council have submitted a presentation document and made representations to Members of the Committee setting out their Transport Strategy for the wider Carrington area. Although noted, the content of the presentation is outside of the remit of this particular report which is simply to establish a funding strategy for the CRR through developer contributions regardless of the route it eventually takes. This does not mean however, that the FoCM proposals are being disregarded, and they will be the subject of future discussion with the Council as the consultation on the route of the CRR progresses.

### 1.0 Introduction and Background

To clarify, a reference to 'early 2021' in Paragraph 1.4 as the date for the submission of a planning application for the Carrington Relief Road is an error and the timetable set out in paragraph 5.11 should be referred to. For the avoidance of doubt this sets out a submission date of December 2021 for any planning application submission.

### Appendix 1

There is an error in one of the figures in Appendix 1 which impacts on some of the model calculations. Rather than address these individually for clarity **Appendix 1** should be replaced with the following:

#### APPENDIX 1: CALCULATION OF CONTRIBUTION

##### Worked example

- The data shows an annualised daily forecast trip rate of 3121.2 trips for storage and distribution sites anticipated on the remaining sites within the Carrington Strategic Location.
- The total annualised daily vehicle trips from all projected future development in the Carrington Strategic Location, is forecast to be 9557.428.
- The cost associated with storage and distribution (B8) development is therefore calculated by dividing the B8 vehicle trips (3121.2) by the total vehicle trips from all projected developments (9557.428) and multiplying this by the highway infrastructure cost (£12m) = £3,265,732.16
- Dividing this figure by the total gross floor area (GFA) projected for storage and distribution, in units of 100sqm, then gives a figure for the costs associated with each unit (of 100sqm) of B8 development: £3,265,732 divided by 1560.60 (156060/100) = £2093 per 100sqm.

- A 20,000sqm development, for example, would generate a contribution of £418,600.

Type of Development	Daily vehicle trips generated
Office (B1)	13
General industrial (B2)	4.6
Storage and distribution (B8)	2
Residential (C3)	4.4

	Anticipated Carrington Development		Total Projected Daily Trips for Use	Total amount of floor space in 100m2/Units		Contribution per £ Unit/100m2	
Office (B1)	13375	sqm	1738.62	133.75	sqm	<b>£13601</b>	/100sq m
General industrial (B2)	26750	sqm	1230.40	267.5	sqm	<b>£4813</b>	/100sq m
Storage and distribution (B8)	156060	sqm	3121.2	1560.6	sqm	<b>£2093</b>	/100sq m
Residential (C3)	788	unit	3467.2	788	units	<b>£4604</b>	/unit
<b>Total</b>			<b>9557.428</b>				

**ITEM 7 100400/OUT/20: Former B&Q Site, Great Stone Road, Stretford, M32 0YP**

**REPRESENTATIONS**

A letter of representation has been received from LCC objecting to the proposed development on the following grounds:

- The applicant has not engaged with LCC directly in respect of this current application or the previously refused scheme;
- LCC is over 156 years old and has hosted international cricket for over 130 years;
- LCC has just completed a ten year £60 million stadium redevelopment including The Pavilion, The Point, new stands and a 150-bedroom Hilton and a Caffe Nero. This programme has acted as a catalyst for further urban regeneration and development and as a key anchor for the Area Action Plan;

- The impact of Covid 19 on LCC has been devastating and as LCC plots a business recovery plan during 2021 and beyond, the cricket ground complex will be a critical asset and managing visitors and overall attendance to the site in a safe and profitable way will become paramount as LCC looks to recover from the virus;
- LCC is reviewing its own site masterplan and development priorities and how it can maximise the opportunities within the AAP. A key element of this strategy is not only maximising LCC's own development opportunities but importantly ensuring that all development within the AAP is both appropriate and consistent with the objectives of the AAP (in particular the promotion of the cricket ground complex as a centre of excellence and internationally significant visitor attraction) and ensuring that development within the AAP does not prejudice the future development of the cricket ground complex by putting the future trading opportunities of LCC at risk;
- The AAP vision identifies opportunities in the Southern Neighbourhood for a new leisure centre with synergies with LCC and consolidating surface car parking into active uses;
- The proposed development is inconsistent with the AAP vision and will prejudice the delivery of the vision outlined for the Southern Neighbourhood in the AAP. In prejudicing that vision, the proposed development will also prejudice the future development of the Emirates Old Trafford Cricket Ground Complex as an internationally significant visitor attraction, cultural and tourism venue;
- The proposed development would represent overly dominant development in the local street scene and would not be in keeping with the existing character or urban pattern due to its scale and massing;
- The scale and massing of the development will result in an overbearing development that causes overshadowing and visual intrusion of the existing properties by virtue of the proposed height and massing of the building;
- The density of the development would mean potentially over 700 new residents living in a relatively small physical space with very little additional public amenity;
- The proximity of the development to the LCC building immediately to the north east of the application site also means that occupiers of the proposed ground floor dwellings will have a poor outlook;
- The proposed development will lead to conflict with the existing activities of LCC at the cricket ground and prejudice the future operation of the cricket ground;
- The commercial operations of LCC as an international cricket venue particularly on large scale events will inevitably impact on the amenity of future residents occupying the development proposed leading to complaints;
- The submitted noise assessment fails to recognise that LCC is legally entitled to host seven concerts per annum;
- The assessment also fails to address all forms of cricket where entertainment is at the heart of the product with large crowds, audience participation, loud amplified music, PA systems. Whilst the noise assessment claims to have assessed a typical one day County cricket match, that is not representative of the far noisier forms of cricket which have emerged as an integral part of the

- future of domestic and international cricket, where capacity crowds and significant noise can be expected;
- These events could exceed 20 days/evenings per year and would generate significant noise/disturbance for residents in the proposed development;
  - LCC considers that the proposed development will lead to complaints from future residents and that will inevitably lead to pressure then being brought to bear on LCC to curtail its operations thereby prejudicing the future operation and development of the cricket ground by LCC, particularly in a post Covid world;
  - The impact of Covid 19 is highly likely to have a long term impact on visitor behaviours and expectations, which is likely to lead to LCC having to maximise visitor usable space with its site in order to provide the safest environment possible. LCC anticipate having to make much fuller use of the site for visitor facilities (not just parking) meaning that noise, crowd activity and visitor movement will be much more extensive across the site than before and also on many more days than has previously been the case. This increased activity/noise will inevitably be much closer to the proposed residential development and will increase the likelihood of conflict between LCC's operations and the residential use proposed in the Application.
  - The proposed development will lead to conflict and pressure for restrictions to be placed on LCC in the future. Given the strategic importance of the Emirates Old Trafford Cricket Ground as a world-renowned sporting complex, LCC submits that such a situation would be unacceptable and that the application should therefore be refused;
  - LCC considers that the scale, height and massing of the proposed development would have a dominant and adverse impact on views from within and outside the ground to the detriment of visitors' experience of the ground and the wider strategic location;
  - Sport England have objected to the Application on the grounds that they consider the development proposed in the Application would have a serious prejudicial impact on the existing cricket facility. LCC support Sport England's objection, which it considers should be given considerable weight in the determination of the Application;
  - Whilst the applicant has reduced the scale of the development proposed in the Application from that proposed in the previous application refused by the Council in 2019 (ref 94974/OUT/18) this is not sufficient to address the concerns relating to the impacts of the development on the cricket ground identified by LCC and Sport England. Indeed, LCC consider that residential development of any scale on the B&Q site would be unacceptable given the incompatibility of such a land use immediately adjacent to the cricket ground complex and the conflict with the strategic vision. Given the special status of the cricket ground as a renowned international sports venue and the Council's vision to protect/enhance that status in the future, it is important that development which will be prejudicial to that objective is not permitted.

The concerns raised by LCC in relation to scale, massing, density, and amenity, including noise are addressed within the report for consideration as part of Agenda Item 7.

**OBSERVATIONS****HIGHWAY MATTERS**

Trip Generation – Further to paragraph 272 of the Committee Report, further modelling information was received from the application. TfGM have reviewed this information and have advised that the revised modelling indicates that the development flows will not have a large negative effect on the operation of the junction.

On this basis it is considered that the proposed development will not have a detrimental impact on the local highway network and is acceptable in this regard.

**DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS**

Since the publication of the main officer report, there has been no progress with the applicant in respect of affordable housing contributions or education contribution. Refusal reason 4 therefore remains.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Amend the wording of the recommendation in the original report to:

**MINDED TO REFUSE (IN CONTESTING THE APPEAL)**

**Page 1**                      **100270/FUL/20: Land Bound By Elsinore Road And Skerton Road, Stretford**

<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	<b>Karen O'Connor (Neighbour) Cllr Duffield Cllr Jarman</b>
	<b>FOR:</b>	<b>Nikki Sillis (B/h of Agent)</b>

**PROPOSAL**

The first sentence of the 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph is amended to read:

*The main road frontage of Blocks A, B and E take the form of townhouses at ground and first floor levels and these have their own defensible space in the form of front gardens, paths and parking spaces.*

The report refers to Blocks A, B and **C** in error.

## **APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION**

Since the Committee report was completed, the agent for the application has submitted an extensive rebuttal to the objections submitted. This is summarised below:

### **Changes to the scheme/Re-notification**

The revisions to the plans were as a result of consultation responses received and ongoing discussions with Officers. The re-notification process allowed the public to review the changes and was completely honest, open and transparent.

### **Size, scale and density**

Consider that the amended scheme, ranging from 6-10 storeys, responds to the varied local context. It balances the impact on the streetscene with the need to provide a high density development in a sustainable location. The proposals should be seen in the context of the wider aspirations for the Civic Quarter including high quality transformative development. The scale and design quality enable the site to contribute to the creation of a vibrant community, adjacent to a local centre and within easy reach of the city centre. The proposal is of a density appropriate to its sustainable urban location and makes efficient use of previously developed land.

### **Design**

The Architects are one of Manchester's top design practices who design great buildings not only in terms of aesthetics but also in terms of liveability. The proposal is a high quality, contemporary scheme, developed in conjunction with Council Officers, and on the basis of a clear understanding of the site and its context. Careful attention has been given to reducing the apparent scale of the buildings and design references are made to the local residential architecture and the use of high quality materials is proposed.

### **Landscaping and Residents Amenity Space**

The landscaping scheme has evolved with the built form and provides an enhanced public realm, assisting with wayfinding and providing amenity space. It encourages low speeds, prioritises pedestrians and provides an attractive, welcoming courtyard space, acting as the heart of the community including a 'clubhouse' feature which promotes a sense of community and reflects the site's past. The scheme proposes a mix of amenity areas totalling 5,131 m<sup>2</sup>. For a scheme of this nature, in an urban context such as this, this level of amenity space is considered an asset. External communal areas will be subject to a management and maintenance regime, ensuring all the proposed elements are of high standard and safe to use.

Across the site it is proposed to incorporate tree planting, a variety of ornamental and native hedge and shrub planting, grassed areas and green/brown roofs. The use of wildlife-friendly species is proposed to enhance on site biodiversity as well as bug hotels and bat and bird boxes to form part of the landscape.

**Residential Amenity**

The amenity impacts have all been fully assessed by Officers and the results considered acceptable. However, we would like to highlight the following:

**Daylight/Sunlight**

Regarding the results of the assessments on existing properties it is relevant that in relation to the 3 rooms (out of 39) that do not achieve the Winter APSH target, this is the case even in the current baseline condition. It is therefore not possible to hit the 100% given the failure of 3 of the rooms under current conditions. This is not a fault of the proposed scheme it is the current baseline situation.

**Overlooking, View and Outlook**

As set out in the report the development would not result in unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy to existing residents due to the distances involved. There is no planning right to a view, however previously the site was a derelict industrial building which was demolished due to being dangerous and attracting drug activity. It is not considered that the development would be unduly overbearing or result in material detriment to outlook of existing properties again due to the distances involved.

**Air Quality**

The Air Quality Assessment concludes that local pollutant levels would not be significantly changed as a result of the operation of the development and future users of the site would not be exposed to unsatisfactory air quality. The lower level of car parking proposed and electric vehicle charging points help reduce pollution.

**Parking**

The overarching design concept of this development relies on low car ownership and this has assisted in providing pleasant streetscapes within the site by avoiding large swathes of hardstanding for parking. The site is in a highly sustainable location and the NPPF seeks to focus significant development in sustainable locations in order to help reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health.

Given the historic Census data, the highly accessible location, parking levels in other comparable residential developments in the area, and the lower level proposed in the Civic Quarter AAP we believe that the parking ratio proposed is acceptable. The applicant has agreed to fund a review of the TROs and a parking review via legal agreement and the LHA have raised no objection on this basis.

**Affordable Housing and Planning Contributions**

As required by policy the scheme provides 10% affordable housing on site which will be secured via a legal agreement. In addition, the applicant has agreed to provide the full education contribution of £573,678 to be secured via legal agreement.

### **Types of Accommodation**

The development is trying to achieve a sense of community and neighbourhood. It seeks to diversify the existing housing offer in the area through the provision of a mix of housing types. Larger apartments and 'townhouses' offer ample space for growing families with on-site amenity space allowing children to grow up in a sustainable and stimulating environment with smaller apartments for young professionals and students due to ready access to the city centre and media city.

The scheme will deliver 367 no. residential units on a brownfield site and 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 to this.

### **CONSULTATIONS**

**Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) Highways**– Comment in relation to the results of the Seymour Grove traffic modelling that it indicates that the junction will be operating above capacity and predicts an increase in delays. Recommend that mitigation should be investigated to reduce this.

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

6 further objections have been received. No new issues raised that are not listed in the main report.

Councillor Akinola has forwarded objections from residents and her response to them but has not confirmed whether she objects to the application. The objections forwarded have already been included in the objection figures in the report.

One comment of support has been submitted summarised below:

- High density development near a tram stop on a former industrial site is a good fit.
- The blocks seem roughly in keeping with the immediate area
- Suggests all but one the parking areas is removed and replaced by green space and some small commercial units included
- Should have good connections to Trafford bar, surrounding roads should be narrowed and the pedestrian sections bollarded off to prevent pavement parking

### **OBSERVATIONS**

It is considered that the comments made in the rebuttal and the additional neighbour representations received are addressed in the main report.

**HIGHWAYS**

The comments received from TfGM in relation to the junction impacts on Seymour Grove are noted. However this is already acknowledged in the comments of the LHA who have analysed the data and note that queue lengths would increase as a result of an increase in traffic in the area. However the LHA are satisfied that these impacts would not be severe and that mitigation is not necessary. Amey, on behalf of the Council, are the Local Highway Authority with TfGM having an advisory role. Therefore the development in its current form is considered to be compliant with the provisions of the NPPF in terms of the impact on the highway network.

**Page 91                      100835/FUL/20:    165A Marsland Road, Sale**

<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	<b>Rory McVean (Neighbour)</b>
	<b>FOR:</b>	

**REPRESENTATIONS**

An additional letter of objection has been received from the owner/occupier of 167 Marsland Road which includes a statement provided on behalf of the owner/occupier of 3 Greystoke Avenue.

The letter reiterates the main points of objection set out in the original representation as summarised in the Committee report, namely over development, loss of light, impact on biodiversity and trees, impact on transport and parking and impact of noise. The following additional points are made:

- With regard to the impact on 3 Greystoke Avenue, it is claimed that Paragraph 35 of the Committee report is incorrect. The statement advises that the existing separation distance is 31m which would be reduced to 25m under the proposal and therefore fails to meet the Council's guidelines for privacy distances.
- In relation to trees, the latest revised plan shows the removal of an additional tree which is not referred to in the Committee Report or submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA).

**OBSERVATIONS****RESIDENTIAL AMENITY**

Further to the above additional representation the measurements in relation to 3 Greystoke Avenue have been checked by the case officer. It is confirmed that the separation distances as referred to by the neighbour above are correct and therefore the measurements stated in Paragraph 35 of the report are incorrect. Whereas the Committee report states that the proposal would exceed the privacy guidelines, it will in fact fall short by 2m. Notwithstanding this, the oblique angle of the properties in relation to one another is a consideration and in this instance it

is considered that the proposal, with a separation distance of 25m would not result in any undue impact which would justify a refusal.

## ECOLOGY/BIODIVERSITY

### Trees

Revised Site Plan 207 shows tree T11 to be removed. This amendment was made further to the neighbour representation from the owner/occupier of 5 Georges Road in which the issue of leaf canopy overhang and leaf litter was raised. The AIA (Appendix A) identifies T11 as a mature sycamore with low retention value. It is therefore considered by the LPA to be appropriate to agree to its removal. A landscaping condition has been recommended within the Committee Report to mitigate the loss of trees as a result of the proposed development.

## CONCLUSION

Having regard to the above it is not considered that the letter of representation raises any matters which would require the deferral of this matter from Committee or for a different recommendation to be made. The recommendation and conditions as set out in the committee report remain unchanged.

**Page 109**                      **101019/VAR/20: 4 Woodlands, Davyhulme**

<b>SPEAKER(S)</b>	<b>AGAINST:</b>	<b>Richard Bean (Neighbour)</b>
	<b>FOR:</b>	<b>Tom Hallett (Agent)</b>

## **PROPOSAL**

In the description of the changes to elevations, whilst there are alterations to rooflights on all elevations, the reference to “Additional rooflights to the eastern elevation” should read “Additional rooflights to the southern elevation”.

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

Two additional letters from previous contributors were received after the Committee Agenda was published. The letters both make reference to a superseded Site Plan, which inaccurately illustrated the total extent of the two storey element of the extension. The Site Plan was amended to illustrate the correct footprint of the two storey projection at the northern end of the front elevation.

Comments were also made in relation to the increased height on the southern side extension and that this is misrepresented on the drawings. The proposed

floor plans and elevation drawings show the increased height. It is noted that a store room and en-suite at first floor level were present in this part of the property prior to this development, albeit smaller than the development as built.

No other new planning considerations have been raised in these letters.

**Page 130**                    **101371/FUL/20: 39 - 42 Ingleby Court, Stretford**

**SPEAKER(S)**            **AGAINST: John Earnshaw**  
**(Neighbour - read out statement only)**

**FOR:**

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

An additional letter of objection has been received on the 15/10/2020 from a person acting on behalf of the residents of 39-42 Ingleby Court. The objection in summary notes:

- Building regulation works to the structure all need to be achieved by carrying out works over and under current apartment ceilings. This will severely impact existing residents;
- The proposal constitutes over development and will result in an incongruous structure not in keeping with the area and a deviation from the NPPF;
- The design of the roof and elevations are of poor quality and inconsistent with the local context;
- The car parking space is being ‘shoe-horned’ into an area not meant for this purpose which will negatively impact on existing parking and cause aggravation between residents.

### **Observations**

The objector’s comments are noted. It is considered that all of the above points have been satisfactorily covered in the committee report.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The recommendation as outlined within the committee report remains unchanged, however condition No. 2 (Approved Plans) has been updated. The change in plan numbers is to include the amended front elevation and roof plans, which have the amended dormer design detailed as discussed in the committee report.

Amended condition No.2 as follows:

2. *The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans: 39-42-1; 39-42-2; 39-42-3 Rev 1; 39-42-4; 39-42-5; 39-42-6; 39-42-7; 39-42-8 Rev 1; 39-42-9; Location Plan; 39-42-11*

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

**Page 143                    101460/HHA/20: 1 Lichfield Road, Davyhulme**

**SPEAKER(S)**

**AGAINST:**

**FOR:**

**Mark Seers  
(Agent)**

### **RECOMMENDATION**

There is a minor grammatical error in the recommended reason for refusal on the main Committee report. It is therefore recommended that the wording of the reason for refusal is amended to the following: -

1. The proposed first floor side extension, by reason of its size, scale, height, massing and proximity to the common boundaries with both Nos. 137 and 139 Canterbury Road, would result in an unacceptable overbearing impact and undue visual intrusion when viewed from the rear windows and rear gardens of these properties. The proposal would therefore have a detrimental impact on the amenity that the occupiers of these dwellings could reasonably expect to enjoy. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy, relevant paragraphs of the NPPF and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions & Alterations.

**Page 154                    101467/HHA/20: 321 Moorside Road, Flixton**

**SPEAKER(S)**

**AGAINST:**

**FOR:**

**Peter Rowe  
(Applicant)  
Cllr S. Procter**

**RICHARD ROE, CORPORATE DIRECTOR, PLACE**

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT:**

**Rebecca Coley, Head of Planning and Development, 1st Floor, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH. Telephone 0161 912 3149**