

REPORT FOR NOTING

Agenda Item	7
----------------	----------

MEETING: PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE
DATE: 28th FEBRUARY 2017
SUBJECT: PLANNING OUTCOMES REPORT
REPORT FROM: HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT
CONTACT OFFICER: DAVID MARNÓ – DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

TYPE OF DECISION: NONE

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION/STATUS: This paper is within the public domain

SUMMARY: The report provides summary on the visits undertaken and analysis provided by Members on the outcomes tour undertaken on 5th August 2016.

OPTIONS & RECOMMENDED OPTION The Committee is recommended to note the report.

IMPLICATIONS:

Corporate Aims/Policy Framework:	Do the proposals accord with the Policy Framework? N/A
Financial Implications and Risk Considerations:	N/A
Statement by Director of Finance and E-Government:	N/A
Equality/Diversity implications:	No
Considered by Monitoring Officer:	N/A
Are there any legal implications?	N/A

Staffing/ICT/Property: N/A

Wards Affected: ALL

Scrutiny Interest: N/A

TRACKING/PROCESS

DIRECTOR:

Chief Executive/ Management Board	Executive Member/Chair	Ward Members	Partners
Scrutiny Commission	Executive	Committee	Council

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 This report presents a brief analysis of the views of the members of the Planning Control Committee who, as part of the on-going training programme, undertook an outcomes visit to a number of sites in the Borough where development had been implemented.
- 1.2 In all, eight sites were visited and each site was scored on the basis of perceived quality of the decision, implementation and an overall general assessment of the scheme.
- 1.3 The outcomes tour is an annual assessment programme and training initiative to enable both Members and Officers to visit sites upon completion and to provide a view upon the success of the development assessed against policy, the surrounding environment and context and to determine any lessons that could be learned in future proposals.
- 1.4 This year, the visits took place on 5th August 2016 and a total of 8 sites were visited. 10 Planning Control Councillors attended the tour this year together with a number of officers. A standardised questionnaire was devised to enable marking/scoring to take place and to enable strengths and weaknesses of individual developments to be identified.

2.0 SITES VISITED AND ANALYSIS

- 2.1 The sites inspected by Members were:
- Tulle Court, Ramsbottom Row, Prestwich
 - Land at 12-22 Warwick Street, Prestwich
 - Solita, Bury New Road, Prestwich
 - Land adjacent to Prestwich Post Office, Bury New Road
 - Former Gasworks, Victoria Street, Bury
 - Water Tower, Land Off Bradshaw Road, Affetside
 - Ramsbottom Cottage Hospital, Nuttall Lane
 - Holcombe Brook Sports Club

Each of the sites were considered on the basis of -

- Visual Amenity – Scale, mass, appearance and quality of finish
- Visual Amenity – design, appearance
- Relationship to neighbours
- Highways issues – access and parking
- Regeneration
- Overall assessment

1. Tulle Court, Ramsbottom Row, Prestwich

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total Score
Visual Amenity/ Scale/mass		1	2	11	5		77/95
Visual Amenity/Design /appearance			5	9	5		76/95
Neighbours			3	11	4	1	73/90
Highway Access			3	10	6		79/95
Parking			3	10	6		79/95
Regeneration			3	7	7	1	72/90
Overall View			2	12	4		74/90
							530/650
							81.5%

Comments made include:

- Residents have told me they are very happy with the site a good example scheme.
- Scheme is an improvement on what was there before. Housing partner has worked well with the council.
- Ample Parking for residents and visitors.
- Inward looking so has helped create neighbourliness.
- A well thought out development which has improved the area.
- Successful scheme overall, devoid of planting.
- Good replacement of 1970's flats and good re-cladding.

Overall this was a well received scheme. The site had taken some considerable time to progress due to the economic slowdown from 2008. However, the site was acquired by a registered landlord and quickly progressed to completion in 2016.

The development of this site completed the final phase of regeneration in this area and provides a welcome development to this part of Prestwich.

2. Land at 12-22 Warwick Street, Prestwich

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total Score
Visual Amenity/ Scale/mass		1	6	13			72/100
Visual Amenity/Design /appearance	1	1	5	13			70/100
Neighbours			12	8			68/100
Highway Access		3	6	4		6	40/65
Parking	1	1	5	2		11	26/45
Regeneration		2	4	9	1	1	57/80
Overall View		1	6	8			52/75
							385/565 68%

Comments made include:

- Lessons to learn about modern design e.g. there are two window styles that are set into wooden clad walls, one has weathered well but the other is letting in damp.
- Like the design but a little out of place in the area.
- Area a bit cramped and overbearing to neighbouring homes.
- A good development in the space available.
- Good stylish contemporary design & removed fire damaged building.
- No allocated parking.
- Looks like a cheap build with flimsy windows and stained cladding.

Mixed response to this scheme from the assessments. Contemporary development approach was won on appeal and therefore had no local intervention in designing to be more locally responsive to design. There appears to still be reluctance to cladding using cedar. However, it has performed better in some parts than in more exposed areas.

The site was always constrained and replaced a burnt down factory. However, the close relationship to the terraced properties at the rear appears to have worked well and is acknowledged that the development is a good one in the space available.

3. Solita, Bury New Road, Prestwich

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total Score
Visual Amenity/ Scale/mass			3	13	4		81/100
Visual Amenity/Design /appearance			4	13	2		74/95
Neighbours			3	10	3	3	64/80
Highway Access		2	4	6	1	6	45/65
Parking	1	2	2	5	1	7	36/55
Regeneration			3	8	3	4	56/70
Overall View		1	2	10	3		63/80
							419/545 77%

Comments:

- Rejuvenated vacant building and is bringing next door also vacant into use.
- No parking provision all on street in a busy town centre location.
- Could do much better lets the row opposite down, does nothing to enhance the area aesthetically.
- Appears to have fit in well, has good trade and has boosted local economy.
- I'd like to see better parking arrangements for people coming into Prestwich in the evening.
- Bury New Road improvement plans will also help the future development of sites like this one.
- First floor windows could be more in keeping with those on church lane.
- A good reconstruction, has improved that corner of Prestwich.

A well received conversion and restoration scheme on the main road frontage within Prestwich Town Centre. The venue is popular and also expanding, reflecting high demand for the venue. The conversion is within the Conservation Area and therefore was required to be sensitive on how changes were proposed.

The building is a historic one and therefore changes needed to be sensitive with its own period, hence the differences with other buildings in the area. Overall, the views of this property's conversion are a welcome investment to the approach into Prestwich and the overall economy.

4. Land adjacent to Prestwich Post Office, Bury New Road

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total Score *
Visual Amenity/ Scale/mass	1	1	5	9	5		79/105
Visual Amenity/Design /appearance			4	10	6		82/100
Neighbours			7	8	3	2	68/90
Highway Access	2	4	5	7	2		63/100
Parking			6	8	7		85/105
Regeneration			5	7	6	2	73/90
Overall View		2	5	12	1		72/100
							522/690 76%

Comments:

- Continued enforcement needed for traffic and transport.
- Access in hindsight could be improved.
- Despite the objections the development has worked well. The predicted traffic chaos has not occurred and complaints are merely token.
- Landscaping sparse and needs to mature.

Despite the local concern of this development being approved in terms of impact upon local highways and traffic movement, the development has assimilated into the main road approach into Prestwich appropriately and following some early issues of non-compliance, the scheme is now compliant with the planning permission and is a welcome addition to the town.

5. Former Gasworks, Victoria Street, Bury

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total Score*
Visual Amenity/ Scale/mass			5	12	4		83/105
Visual Amenity/Design /appearance			7	11	3		80/105
Neighbours			1	3	4	13	35/40
Highway Access		1	1	10	8		83/100
Parking			2	9	9		87/100
Regeneration			6	8	5		75/95
Overall View		1	5	13	3		84/110
							527/655 80%

Comments:

- Implications for use of employment land in future.
- Excellent disabled car spaces.
- Well used and a smart use of a rundown corner.
- Very easy to access the site.
- Good access parking is no problem.
- Good scheme and positive regeneration. Disappointing employment uses not delivered.
- New junction layout works well.
- Refurbished a piece of scrub land.
- Excellent planting all around the site.
- A much improved area for gateway to town centre.
- Has improved the area for small retailers and businesses on Bolton Road.

This scheme has been well received and is considered to have been a good regeneration scheme on a site that was previously run down. There is a clear acknowledgement concerning the loss of the previous employment site and this is further compounded that the site has not delivered in all of its original promises. However, the value of the development in retail terms is acknowledged and is considered to have provided a positive benefit to the local environment.

6. Water Tower, Land Off Bradshaw Road, Affetside

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total Score *
Visual Amenity/ Scale/mass			2	15	4		86/105
Visual Amenity/Design /appearance			2	15	4		86/105
Neighbours			1	6	7	7	62/70
Highway Access		9	8	4			58/105
Parking	3	5	9	3		1	52/100
Regeneration	1	1	8	7	1	2	60/90
Overall View		1	3	15	2	1	81/105
							485/680 71%

Comments:

- It looks good. Extension at back has no planning permission. Suspect they have never intended it to be a bunkhouse.
- Not enough visibility big gate is a problem.
- Extension at the rear doesn't look as in-keeping with the rest of the property.
- Extension to rear looks poor.
- Only real concern is the road access.
- No need for the big gate.
- Roadway passing precarious.
- Looks a reasonable scheme but thin end of wedge.
- Aesthetically pleasing, issues about development not stuck to original plans.
- Building not being used as originally planned.
- Unique and unusual

This development was acknowledged as an unusual one in that the development comprised the conversion of a former water tower. There were concerns in relation to the adjoining highway, being a rural road, which meant that access/egress/passing traffic needed to demonstrate particular care. Caution is flagged up so as not to become the 'thin end of the wedge' and become a use that was not originally part of the reasons for allowing the unusual scheme to be granted in the first place. Parking provision was an obvious issue on this scheme and the large gate (unauthorised) is considered to be unnecessary.

7. Ramsbottom Cottage Hospital, Nuttall Lane

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total Score*
Visual Amenity/ Scale/mass			3	10	8		89/105
Visual Amenity/Design /appearance			1	10	9		88/100
Neighbours		1	6	5	9		85/105
Highway Access		2	5	8	6		81/105
Parking			7	8	5	1	78/100
Regeneration		1	1	12	6	1	83/100
Overall View			3	12	6		87/105
							591/720 82%

Comments:

- The streetlights look very cheap in relation to the quality of the development.
- A good quality development which has brought an old site back into use.
- Arguably over developed. Not bad enough to refuse but needs finishing off.
- Road unfinished, no real pavements, no real parking areas for visitors etc...
- Feels a little crammed in towards the bottom of the site.
- Really attractive range of styles, appropriate materials and colours.
- No pavements. Concerning as these appear to be aimed at families.
- Needs dropped curbs and disabled pavements.
- Good to see stonework from original facade retained on site.
- Dereliction cleared. Historic elements retained. More landscape needed.
- Would like better streetlights perhaps coloured black to go with railings at entrance of development.

The scheme had not quite been finished at the time of the visit with road surfacing requiring completion. However, the overall layout and relationship of the site to the surrounding property was considered to be successfully achieved. The heritage issue with the site has provided an unusual marker insofar as the building date stone being placed on the site's entrance and was praised. There were concerns about 'shared highway' spaces but overall this did not heavily go against the development as a whole.

8. Holcombe Brook Sports Club

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total Score*
Visual Amenity/Scale/mass	1	11	6	2	1		66/105
Visual Amenity/Design/appearance	3	13	4				41/100
Neighbours		1	4	6	4	5	58/75
Highway Access		3	5	10	3		76/105
Parking		1	6	6	7		79/100
Regeneration	3	3	6	3		6	45/75
Overall View	2	6	12	2			58/110
							423/670 63%

Comments:

- Done on the cheap, disappointing design and landscaping could have been much better with more thought and money.
- Good community impact seems evident.
- Roof has failed to meet 'green' definitions.
- Very poor landscaping an opportunity seems to have been missed.
- Disappointing, great community facility unfortunately design is poor.
- The finished materials outside including car park appear to have been done quite cheaply. The car park looks unfinished.
- Roof looks tacked on mix of materials looks old.
- Building has been cheapened a reduction in quality.
- Roof does not fit with surroundings a seeded roof would have blended beautifully and reflected hills.
- Pavement to road rough and unfinished.
- It seems good very useful for community space.
- A poor building visually an eyesore. Only saving grace is the solar panels, however it is not what was promised.
- Building looks out of place cladding needs painting or something.
- Bad design not obvious what the use is, wood cladding looks shabby.
- Chances to deliver something special lost.
- Design appears compromised, elements that made the scheme good have disappeared.
- Roof different to original approved plans and no planting.
- Crushed stone car park looks awful but adequate parking.
- The roof is an eyesore in this area.
- The problem is the materials don't lend themselves to painting so in its present state it's poor.
- A great facility for bury residents although design is very lazy could have done better.

This scheme originally started as a particularly green development in sustainability terms through softer/increased levels of planting. Through time and in its development, certain elements were replaced. Whilst still sustainable in approach, visually, the adoption of solar panels and elevational changes resulted in a strong view that the development has not delivered. The standard of finish, design, landscaping and appearance all came in for some levels of criticism and the opportunity to deliver something special was lost. Overall, the scheme was not considered to be as successful as it could have been.

Overall assessment Scores		
7	Ramsbottom Cottage Hospital, Ramsbottom	82%
1	Tulle Court, Prestwich	81.5%
5	Former Gas Works Victoria Street (ALDI etc), Bury	80%
3	Solita Bury New Road, Prestwich	77%
4	Land adjacent to Prestwich Post Office (KFC), Prestwich	76%
6	Water Tower Bradshaw Road, Walshaw	71%
2	Land at Warwick Street, Prestwich	68%
8	Holcombe Brook Sports Club, Holcombe Brook	63%

3.0 CONCLUSION

- 3.1 The outcomes tour provides an insight to schemes that have been considered by Members, how they have been carried out and their integration into the surrounding context in which they are located.
- 3.2 The scoring of the sites visited this year demonstrates that development is of a very good standard, shows successful implementation and integration. The site of least success was still considered to have not delivered the original intentions of the scheme and cost cutting/financial constraints have had an impact. 5 of the schemes were in the upper quartile in terms of standard and success and both of the highest scoring schemes had important issues around heritage to consider, which may have contributed to the overall quality of finish.
- 3.3 Overall the valuable lessons learnt from the exercise are that the issues assessed by officers and duly considered in the respective reports demonstrate that the planning process is working well and that feedback from this exercise continues to guide how future proposals are considered.

List of Background Papers: - The respective planning applications

Contact Details:-

David Marno | Head of Development Management | Planning Services |
 Department for Resources and Regulation | Bury Council
 3 Knowsley Place, Duke Street, Bury BL9 0EJ

Office: +44 (0) 161 253 5291

Fax: 0161 253 7373

Email to: d.marno@bury.gov.uk

Web site: www.bury.gov.uk/e-planning