

REPORT FOR NOTING

MEETING: PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE
DATE: 24th OCTOBER 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 10th August 2017.

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 as built.
- 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 10th August 2017 and a total of 8 sites were visited. Nine Planning Control Committee Members 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:
- McCarthy & Stone Apartments (Former Claremont Home), Park View Road, Prestwich
 - Land adjacent to 15 Prestfield Road
 - Former garage colony between 22 and 24 Whalley Road, Whitefield
 - Whittaker Street, Radcliffe
 - Land off Wellington Street, Bury
 - Former garage colony at Greymont Road, Bury
 - Twine Valley Farm, Church Road, Shuttleworth

- McCarthy & Stone Apartments, Longsight Road, Holcombe Brook

Each of the sites were considered on the basis of -

- Visual Amenity – Scale, mass, appearance and quality of finish
- Landscaping, trees and ecology
- Relationship to neighbours
- Highways issues – access and parking
- Regeneration
- Environmental Impacts – landscaping, trees, crime & security
- Overall assessment

2.2 The Sites and assessment

1. Site of former Claremont Home, Park View Road

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total Score
Visual Amenity/ Scale/mass				4	13		81/85
Visual Amenity/Design /appearance				3	14		82/85
Neighbours				6	11		79/85
Highways				6	11		79/85
Parking		1	3	10	3		66/85
Regeneration			1	7	8	1	71/80
Overall View				4	12		76/80
							534/585 91.2%

Comments

A well-received scheme scoring highly in most respects. There was a strong level of support for the design, height, scale and mass, given that the building is sited on a large plot within the urban area. Impacts upon neighbours were considered to be minimal and the building was considered to be well designed. There were some reservations on parking which during the visit did dominate the immediate access areas and there was some conflict between servicing and general parking which could have been better resolved. The building was considered to sit well within mature trees that had been retained.

2. Land Adjacent to 15 Prestfield Road

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total Score
Visual Amenity/Scale/mass			11	6			57/85
Visual Amenity/Design/appearance	1	2	8	6			53/85
Neighbours		2	11	4			53/85
Highways		2	6	9			58/85
Parking			7	10	1		66/90
Regeneration			5	8	3	1	62/80
Overall View		6	8	1			40/75
							389/585 66.4%

Comments

The redevelopment of this site has been a long time in the making and feelings seem reasonably content with the scheme. Some elements scored highly such as regeneration and the general relationships in terms of neighbours and parking provision were acceptable. The site had a difficult role to perform in relation to the motorway and noise generated from it, thus keeping the height meant that overlooking was a potential. However, the design that forced the solution was reasonable in terms of the scoring but a few were less convinced with the finish of the build and there was a feeling of a lack of landscaping.

3. Former garage colony site between 22 and 24 Whalley Road

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total Score
Visual Amenity/Scale/mass			4	12	2		70/90
Visual Amenity/Design/appearance			4	13	1		69/90
Neighbours			3	11	4		73/90
Highways			8	9	1		65/90
Parking		3	10	5			56/90
Regeneration			1	9	6	1	69/80
Overall View			2	13	2		68/85
							470/615 76.4%

Comments

One of two similar schemes for residential redevelopment of a former garage sites. Overall considerations were that the scheme was well received and that the site presented itself appropriately in the urban area. The scores reflect that there was a high level of delivery by the scheme above the average, reflecting the difficulties of developing small plots. However, the execution of the development was rated as successful. There were elements of the development that could be re-looked at such as parking provision

increased and better located as well as the appearance of the highways being dominant visually.

4. Whittaker Street, Radcliffe

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total Score
Visual Amenity/Scale/mass			1	9	7		74/85
Visual Amenity/Design/appearance			2	8	7		73/85
Neighbours				9	8		76/85
Highways				8	9		77/85
Parking			1	10	6		73/85
Regeneration			1	7	7	1	66/75
Overall View			7	7			49/70
							488/570 85.6%

Comments

A highly scoring site delivering social housing/care needs. The site scored above average in all cases with most of the scores in the upper quartile of consideration. There was some consideration that the scale and mass could have been improved, design improved as well as parking and regeneration qualities. However, the vast majority of the considered responses were satisfied that the scheme delivered what it needed to and raised no real concerns.

5. Land at Wellington Street, Bury

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total Score
Visual Amenity/Scale/mass				5	13		85/90
Visual Amenity/Design/appearance			1	2	14		81/85
Neighbours				3	12	3	72/75
Highways				7	11		83/90
Parking				3	15		87/90
Regeneration				4	14		86/90
Overall View				3	12		72/75
							566/595 95.1%

Comments

This site as a training centre for GMFRS is an unusual one and has a role of functionality, training and scenarios to deliver which is difficult to achieve. However the public face of the site is such that there were no concerns expressed about location and what is seen from outside the site. Within the site, the GMFRS have made significant efforts to ensure that the appearance is well maintained, is well landscaped and has brought about a very

much needed level of regeneration to the area. As a facility, the general responses rated this site very highly.

6. Garage site at Greymont Road, Bury

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total Score
Visual Amenity/Scale/mass			1	10	4		63/75
Visual Amenity/Design/appearance			5	9	1		56/75
Neighbours			3	8	3		56/70
Highways				8	6		62/70
Parking				8	7		67/75
Regeneration			1	5	8	1	63/70
Overall View			2	10	2		56/70
							423/505 83.7%

Comments

Another former garage colony redeveloped for residential purposes scored highly and above the third quartile. Considered to be a successful redevelopment of an urban site and scoring well in terms of height, design and appearance. Parking was considered to be appropriate and did not detract from the street scene and the development had good relationships to neighbours in this well established residential area.

7. Twine Valley Farm, Church Road, Shuttleworth

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total Score
Visual Amenity/Scale/mass	8	5					18/65
Visual Amenity/Design/appearance	2	6	4	1			30/65
Neighbours	4	2	3			4	17/45
Highways	3	1	1	2		6	16/35
Parking	4	1	1	1		6	13/35
Regeneration	7	1				4	9/40
Overall View	6	3	2				18/55
							121/340 35.5%

Comments

An unusual case following the grant of permission by the Planning Inspectorate, this building was constructed under the prior approval notices procedures and therefore the input that Local Planning authorities have is extremely limited. An agricultural building in the Green Belt sited high above the surrounding area and built form, is largely the reason for the low scores attributed to the development. Evidently, the general consensus of not being able to express local planning input into a scheme is not well received but is an example of deregulation, which overall, placed the consideration of this development in the lowest quartile.

8. McCarthy Stone Retirement Apartments, Holcombe Brook

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total Score
Visual Amenity/ Scale/mass			3	10	2		59/75
Visual Amenity/Design /appearance			2	10	3		61/75
Neighbours			3	10	2		59/75
Highways			1	11	3		62/70
Parking				10	4		60/70
Regeneration			4	7	2	1	50/65
Overall View				13	1		57/70
							408/500 81.6%

Comments

This is the follow up development to a site visited last year where the tennis club that occupied this site had moved and developed out their new facility of a nearby site. This development, constructed as a second phase, delivered accommodation with care facilities availability for the over 55's. A general perception of the scheme was that it was appropriate in terms of its appearance, height and relationship to neighbours and caused no concerns in terms of parking or highways. A few considered that the scheme was average but overall, the views were that the site performed well in planning terms.

Summary table of scores

Land at Wellington Street, Bury	95.1%
Site of former Claremont Home, Park View Road	91.2%
Whittaker Street, Radcliffe	85.6%
McCarthy Stone Retirement Apartments, Holcombe Brook	81.6%
Garage site at Greymont Road, Bury	83.7%
Former garage colony site between 22 and 24 Whalley Road	76.4%
Land Adjacent to 15 Prestfield Road	66.4%
Twine Valley Farm, Church Road, Shuttleworth	35.5%

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 an example of deregulation where intervention is constrained.

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