

## List No. 14

<b>Woodhouse Park Ward</b>	<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Date of Appln</b>	<b>Committee Date</b>
	082694/FO/2007/S2	2nd Apr 2007	26th July 2007

**Proposal** Erection of a 7 storey hotel comprising 169 rooms with 126 associated car parking spaces and landscaping

**Location** Land Adjacent To Runger Lane, Off Wilmslow Road, Woodhouse Park, Manchester

**Applicant** Manchester Airport Developments C/o Agent

**Agent** N J L Consulting Ltd Adamson House, Tower Business Park, Wilmslow Road, Didsbury , Manchester, M2 2YY

### Description

This application was placed before the Wythenshawe Area Committee at its meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2007. At that meeting they resolved to refer the application to the Planning and Highways Committee for determination, strongly urging members of that Committee to visit the site with the three local Ward Councillors to view the impact of the height of the proposed hotel on the surrounding area.

This application relates to a plot of land, approximately 0.61 hectares (1.5 acres) in size, which is situated to the north-east of junction 6 of the M56 motorway and adjacent to the site of a recently approved Tulip Inn hotel development which is currently under construction (ref. 081607/MO/2006/S2). The motorway, which is aligned broadly north-south in this vicinity, is elevated above ground level on a substantial embankment as it crosses over the A538 Wilmslow Road. Beyond the M56 motorway lies the Four Seasons Hotel and then the eastern fringes of the residential area of Hale Barns.

Runger Lane lies to the east of the application site, forming the boundary between the site and the World Freight Terminal complex, the latter of which is the eastern most extent of development associated with Manchester Airport. The site itself is within the boundaries of the Green Belt and also the Airport Operational Area and Major Development Site, as defined by the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) for the City of Manchester.

To the immediate south of the site stands the four storey Travelodge Hotel, planning permission for which was granted in outline on 9th August 2004 (ref. 069871/OO/2003/S2), followed by the reserved matters on 29th November 2004 (ref. 073591/MO/2004/S2). Beyond this, the junction 6 interchange area incorporates a Highways Agency maintenance depot, together with areas of mounding and tree planting. Farmland extends southwards from the interchange. There is further managed grassland to the north of this site, beyond this area lies Hasty Lane, a minor road severed, except by pedestrian subway, by the M56 motorway.

The applicants are seeking consent for the erection of a 7 storey, 169 bedroomed hotel, including ancillary restaurant and bar facilities, along with parking facilities for approximately 126 vehicles. The hotel would be located in the eastern half of the site and would run parallel with the proposed future slip-

## List No. 14

road. The hotel would be provisionally accessed off Runger Lane, via the driveway which would serve the Travelodge Hotel and Tulip Inn, until the future extension of Avro Way has been completed. Once the extension works to Avro Way have been completed, the proposed hotel will have its own dedicated access point off this road.

### Consultations

**Local Residents/Businesses** – Correspondence has been received from a local resident who has stated that the height of any future buildings at Manchester Airport should be kept to a minimum to try and retain a more sympathetic landscape to the surrounding area. Seven storeys as proposed for this development is too high.

Correspondence has also been received from Burford Delta Ltd, owners of land of Thorley Road to the north of the airport. They have made the following observations:

- The site is within the Greenbelt and comprises greenfield land which is currently undeveloped.
- The supporting planning statement submitted by NJL Consulting is at some pains to argue that the hotel would be appropriately located within the Greenbelt because it is “infill” development and it passes the “very special circumstances” test under Policy E2.1. The question whether the site properly constitutes an “infill” site given its location and the open land to the immediate north (running up to Hasty Lane) is a matter for the Council to carefully consider and determine. We have our doubts
- In assessing the need for the hotel (by reference to the submitted PKF Report) the planning statement says that it is important that demand is met and is as closely linked to the airport as possible. The statement states that the application site is the only readily available site which can be delivered within this timeframe (i.e. by around 2008)
- Burford's Thorley Lane site is previously developed; outside the greenbelt; better related to the airport terminal buildings, being the main driver of demand for hotel bed spaces, (rather than the stated cargo centre); and sustainably located with good access to public transport facilities. In these circumstances the Burford site is clearly preferable in policy terms, in relation to both the UDP and RSS, which creates a presumption in favour of the Burford site ahead of development on greenfield, Greenbelt land. The Burford site is also immediately available and can accommodate the need identified by the airport authority within the timescale that is envisaged.

## List No. 14

- Burford's Thorley Lane site lies on previously developed land which is not part of the Green Belt. For that reason alone it is to be preferred as a location for hotel development. It is well located in relation to the airport's passenger terminal buildings (in contrast to the application site's proximity to the cargo centre) and is well served by public transport.
- The report does not consider it necessary to remind members of the protections given by regional planning guidance to the Green Belt and to important habitats. The only policies which are mentioned are those relating to economic growth.
- Paragraph 3.4 of PPG2 provides that new buildings will be inappropriate in the Green Belt unless they constitute limited infilling or redevelopment of major existing developed sites identified in adopted local plans and meet the criteria in paragraphs C3 or C4 of Annex C to PPG2. The application does not propose redevelopment of an existing developed site. The report is equivocal on whether the proposed development would constitute infilling. In setting out the principles governing infilling, the report concludes that the harm to the openness of the Green Belt is questionable. This cannot, in our view, be reasonable advice to members: the harm to the identified purposes of Green Belt designation, in particular that of maintaining openness, is evident.
- Given the doubt as to whether the application proposes infilling, members ought to be advised that a very cautious approach ought to be taken to determining compliance with PPG2. Unfortunately, they have not. In addition, the very special circumstances needed to outweigh this harm have not been made out by the applicants or the Council in its report to members. The suggestion which appears to be made in the report is that the development of a hotel in this location would help support the growth of the airport. No evidence has been supplied to the Council to ground this claim. Even if this assertion is (however lacking in credibility) accepted, there is no evidence to show that the development of a hotel in a different, less environmentally-sensitive location would not achieve the same benefits.
- Regarding the protection of great crested newts, the advice given to members about this issue is potentially misleading in several respects. We do not believe that there has been sufficient or sufficiently careful consideration of the relevant tests where, as here, there has been a negative assessment of the implications of the proposal for the site. Officers first advise that they believe that the applicants have provided information that the proposed development "will be essential to the operational efficiency and amenity of the airport" (emphasis added). This is not the same as concluding that the development is imperative for reasons of overriding public interest: indeed, no conclusion could be reached on the information supporting the application or, it is submitted, by any reasonable authority. Furthermore, it is clear that the reports submitted with the application do not conclude that the hotel proposal is essential to the efficiency and amenity of the airport.

## List No. 14

- Secondly, the consideration of alternatives is flawed. The test is not whether there are alternative sites for the habitat affected, but whether there are alternative locations for the development proposed. Only one alternative site is considered, being the principal habitat for the great crested newts. Such a cursory consideration of this issue is insufficient to advise members and to meet the legal test. In particular, other potential hotel sites which do not include, or are not located next to, important habitats have not been considered.

**Wythenshawe Regeneration Team** – We support the application and would want to maximise local economic benefit in terms of construction and end-user jobs through the Airport Academy that is based within the Wythenshawe Forum (Forum Learning) at Wythenshawe Town Centre.

However, as part of the Wythenshawe Town Centre Master Plan, a hotel development has been identified as a key priority in the current phase of development activity. It is essential that the Airport continue to proactively promote the Town Centre as an investment location and liaise fully with relevant colleagues within the Wythenshawe Regen Team and Manchester City Council. Discussions and feedback on progress, issues and opportunities must also be reported at the Wythenshawe Town Centre Project Board meetings of which Manchester Airport is a key member

**Greater Manchester Police (Architectural Liaison Officer)** – No objections.

**Greater Manchester Ecology Unit** – The development will effect Great Crested Newts, a European Protected Species. Before the application can be determined a Great Crested Newt survey and method statement giving details of how any disturbance to newts is to be mitigated should be submitted for approval.

**Natural England** – Natural England have confirmed that the mitigation proposals for the Great Crested Newts is acceptable.

**Aerodrome Safeguarding Officer** – No objection subject to the landscape scheme being amended to include the removal of oak, beech and ash from the native structure planting and the creation of a management plan to ensure the removal of starling, corvid and pigeon roosts and rookeries, both of which are required to avoid endangering the safe operation of aircraft through the attraction of birds.

**Highways Agency** – No objections to the application being granted consent. The hotel is not a generator in its own right and the only travel consequences are in relation to routing and time of travel between the hotel and the airport, with the most commodious route being via Thorley Lane rather than via the M56.

**Head of Engineering Services** – The Head of Engineering Services has made the following comments:

- The applicants are required to submit an operational assessment of the existing access/Runger Lane junction and a clear link from the car park to the existing access off Runger Lane needs to be indicated on the drawing for consideration.

## List No. 14

- A Travel Plan should be submitted under the guidance of Transportation Policy team.

**Landscape Practice Group** – No objection to the proposal, subject to the receipt of tree pit details and protection measures for the existing hedge and trees adjacent to the adjacent Travelodge development.

**Head of Environmental Services** – Suggests a number of conditions to protect residential amenity.

**Environment and Operations Technical Services** – There are no trees of significance on the site and as such there is no objection to the proposal.

### Issues

**Unitary Development Plan (UDP)** – The following UDP policies are relevant in this instance:

Policy EW20 - The future expansion of, and future development at, Manchester Airport will take place within the Airport Operational Area, the boundary of which is defined on the proposals map.

Policy EW21 - A 'Major Developed Site' within the Green Belt has been identified at Manchester Airport and its boundary is shown on the Proposals Map. Infilling and re-development within the boundary of this site will be treated as appropriate development providing it meets the tests set out in Annex C of PPG2 and is in line with the developments and uses listed within this policies reason, of which hotel is one, which are necessary for the operational efficiency and amenity of the Airport.

Airport development proposals which do not meet the above infilling or redevelopment criteria, but are in accord with the uses set out below in the Policy Reason, will be subject to the test of very special circumstances as referenced in Part 1 Policy E2.1. The location of such Airport development proposals within the Major Developed Site will be a material consideration in determining whether very special circumstances exist. It must be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Council that it is essential to the operational efficiency and amenity of the Airport that such development is located within the Major Developed Site and not outside of the Site. It must also be demonstrated that such development will assist in enhancing the economic vitality of the Region.

Policy EW22 - Further hotel accommodation, equivalent to about two thirds of that in existence or approved on 1st July 1983, will be permitted within the operational area. This accommodation will be provided on a site immediately north of the existing passenger terminal or in limited extensions of hotels in existence or approved on 1st July 1983 and will not be permitted in other locations within the Airport Operational Area. (The policy has been largely superseded by revised Policy EW21).

Policy EW23 - The Council will seek to minimise the visual impact of areas of vehicles parking within the Airport Operational Area.

## List No. 14

Policy EW24 - The Council will seek to ensure that a high standard of landscaping is provided throughout the Airport Operational Area.

Policy EW25 - In considering applications for development within the Airport Operational Area, the Council will require a high standard of design which reflects the prestigious nature of an international gateway Airport and its location with and adjacent to the Greater Manchester Green Belt.

Policy EW30 - The Council will take into account the needs of pedestrians and cyclists in considering all proposals for development, and will seek to create and improve safe and attractive pedestrian and cycle routes linking residential areas with employment areas at the Airport.

Policy E2.1 - Within the Green Belt planning permission will not be granted, except in very special circumstances, for the construction of new buildings for purposes other than agriculture, forestry, essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, for cemeteries, and for other uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of including land in it.

In all instances the Council will ensure that the visual amenities of the Green Belt are not injured by proposals for development within or conspicuous from the Green Belt which, although they would not prejudice its main purpose, might be inappropriate by reason of their siting, materials or design.

Policy E2.3 - The Council will protect important wildlife habitats, and where appropriate, will designate areas as local nature reserves.

In all instances the Council will ensure that the visual amenities of the Green Belt are not injured by proposals for development within or conspicuous from the Green Belt which, although they would not prejudice its main purpose, might be inappropriate by reason of their siting, materials or design.

Policy T4 - States that in dealing with all proposals connected with the Airport, the Council will continue to pursue its present policy of seeking to promote its development in a way which is environmentally a sensitive.

DC16 - States that in considering development proposals for any site, the retention of existing trees and the planting of new trees within the public highway and along the public frontages of the site will be encouraged by the Council.

## List No. 14

**Wythenshawe Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF)** – Approved in December 2004, the SRF includes a number of policies related to the airport, the most relevant of which in this instance are:

- Policy ED1 - to support the continued growth of Manchester Airport and Wythenshawe, as one of the UK's premier business locations, capable of attracting corporate end users on an international scale to the conurbation.

**Adopted Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West (RPG13)** – Since 2004 the RSS has formed part of the development plan, as such the weight to be attached to its policies has increased. It contains policies that address core principles of development including the following:

- DP2, *Enhancing the Quality of Life* - ensuring development provides a high quality of life for this and future generations
- DP3, *Quality in New Development* - ensuring that new development demonstrates good design and respect for its setting.

In addition, the national and regional significance of Manchester Airport is specifically noted in the RPG. Paragraph 10.14 states that "Development Plans and local transport plans should seek to capitalise on the economic activity the Airport generates to assist urban regeneration, particularly in deprived areas, though future growth will need to strike an appropriate balance between economic, environmental and social impacts".

Furthermore, Policy T5 states that "The role of Manchester Airport as the North of England's key international air gateway and its potential to become an important multi-modal transport interchange are recognised and supported ". The policy continues stating that development plans and local transport plans should seek to capitalise on the economic activity the airport generates to assist urban regeneration, particularly in deprived areas, though future growth will need to strike an appropriate balance between economic, environmental and social impacts.

Also considered to be of relevance in this instance is policy ER5 (Biodiversity and Nature Conservation), it states that planning authorities and other agencies in their plans, policies and proposals will afford the strongest levels of protection to statutorily protected species.

**Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West** – Publicised in January 2006, this draft RSS document provides a framework for the physical development of the region over the next 15 to 20 years. The following policies are considered of relevance in this instance:

- Policy DP1, *Regional Development Principles* - proposals and schemes must demonstrate excellent design quality, sustainable construction, efficiency in resource use and respect for their physical and natural setting
- Policy RT3, - plans and strategies should support economic activity generated and sustained by the Region's airports, in particular the importance of Manchester Airport as a key economic driver for the North

## List No. 14

of England. It states further that the future operational and infrastructure requirements, surface access demands and environmental impacts for the airport should be identified in airport master plans and other relevant plans and strategies, based on the strategic framework for the development of airport capacity set out in the White Paper "Future of Air Transport".

- Policy MCR3, *Southern part of the Manchester City Region* - Plans and strategies in the southern part of the city region will sustain and promote economic growth located in accordance with policy W1 and W2 and contribute to the following key growth driver: Manchester Airport.

**Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West, Examination in Public (EIP) Report of the Panel** – The First Secretary of State appointed a Panel to conduct an EIP of selected issues arising out of the draft RSS. The Panel met between October 2006 and February 2007 and made comprehensive observations and recommendations in the form of the *Report of the Panel*.

In that report the Panel have stated they share some of the concerns about the definition of operational development in respect of airports. For instance, hotels are included in the schedule agreed between the NWRA, AGMA, MCC and the proprietors of Manchester and Liverpool John Lennon Airports, but are explicitly excluded from the definition of an operational building for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1985. Nevertheless, the Panel considers it important that there should be hotel accommodation at major airports, especially to provide for passengers and aircrew in transit. The Panel note that the alternative of them having to travel elsewhere to find accommodation would not be consistent with the objective of reducing the need to travel.

In addition to the above, it should be noted that policy RT3, referred to above, has been redesignated as Policy RT5 by the Panel.

**Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS 1 "Delivering Sustainable Development")** – PPS1 states that planning proposals should be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The guidance continues highlighting the importance of locating development at suitable locations to ensure the economic prosperity.

PPG2 sets out five purposes for the inclusion of land within the greenbelt, namely to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; to assist and safeguard the countryside from encroachment; to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other open land.

**Planning Policy Guidance 2 (PPG2 "Green Belts")** – PPG2 states that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development. Such development should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

## List No. 14

PPG2 goes on to state that Green Belt policies in development plans should ensure that any planning applications for inappropriate development would not be in accord with this plan. These exceptional cases would thus be treated as departures from the development plan.

In providing advice on new building PPG2 states that the construction of new buildings inside a Green Belt is inappropriate unless it is for, amongst other things, limited infilling or redevelopment of major existing developed sites identified in adopted local plans. In terms of infilling the guidance states that such infilling should:

- have no greater impact on the purposes of including land in the Green Belt than the existing development,
- not exceed the height of existing buildings,
- not lead to a major increase in the developed proportion of the site.

**Planning Policy Statement 9 (PPS9, "Biodiversity and Geological Conservation")** – PPS9 (para 1[vi]) states that the aim of planning decisions should be to prevent harm to biodiversity and geological conservation interests. Where granting planning permission would result in significant harm to those interests, local planning authorities will need to be satisfied that the development cannot reasonably be located on any alternative sites that would result in less or no harm. In the absence of any such alternatives, local planning authorities should ensure that, before planning permission is granted, adequate mitigation measures are put in place. Where a planning decision would result in significant harm to biodiversity and geological interests which cannot be prevented or adequately mitigated against, appropriate compensation measures should be sought. If that significant harm cannot be prevented, adequately mitigated against, or compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.

**Planning Policy Guidance 13 (PPG13, "Transport")** – In Annex B: Planning for Transport it states the guidance acknowledges that airports have become major transport interchanges and traffic generators, and attract a range of related and non-related developments. It states further that in preparing their development plans and in determining planning applications local planning authorities should consider the extent to which development is related to the operation of the airport, and is sustainable given the prevailing and planned levels of public transport. In this respect:

1. the operational needs of the airport includes runway and terminal facilities, aircraft maintenance and handling provision, and warehousing and distribution services related to goods passing through the airport;
2. related development appropriate to airports includes transport interchanges, administrative offices, short and long stay parking;
3. less directly related development includes hotels, conference and leisure facilities, offices and retail. For such activities, the relationship to the airport related business should be explicitly justified, be of an appropriate scale relative to core airport related business and be assessed against relevant policy elsewhere in planning policy guidance; and

## List No. 14

4. non-related development which should be assessed against relevant policy elsewhere in planning guidance.

**The Northern Way** – The Northern Way is an inter-regional growth strategy seeking a step change in the way in which the regional development is approached and providing an innovative joined-up approach to economic development and sustainable communities. The Northern Way covers the three regions of the North West, North East and Yorkshire and Humberside. It acknowledges the importance of regional airports especially Manchester, the largest airport outside London.

**The City Region Development Programme (CRDP)** – The Manchester CRDP forms part of the Northern Way and specifically sets out how the Manchester City Region will contribute to the economic development referred to in the inter-regional growth strategy.

The Manchester CRDP, with specific reference to development capacity at Manchester Airport, advocates that regional agencies are to support medium and long term planning of capacity for freight, logistics, commercial and industrial development, hotels and airport services.

**Manchester Airport Group's (MAG) Development Strategy** – MAG published its long-term development aspirations in a document known as the Development Strategy to 2005 (May 1993) and also in the draft Development Strategy to 2015 (January 2003). The development strategy sets out six key aims and a range of policies to fulfil these, including specific policies on ancillary services such as hotel development. The document also provides detailed forecasts in terms of traffic growth and long-term forecasting in airport transport movements.

Para 13.3 of the 2005 Development Strategy refers specifically to hotels within the airport. Policies within the development strategy are based on an assessment of demand for new hotel facilities at the airport and the likely future provision of hotels in the vicinity. The report also specifies that new hotels are to be located in a band running from the M56 through to the existing hotel campus to the east of Outwood Lane.

**Principle of Development in the Green Belt** – The principle of a development of this nature in this Green Belt location has already been established with the approval of the Travelodge Hotel and the Tulip Inn on the adjacent sites. Furthermore, this site was originally contained within the Tulip Inn application granted outline consent in February 2007. Notwithstanding this, the development must still be tested against the guidance contained within PPG2 and against the relevant UDP policies.

The application site is within a major developed site within the Green Belt. Policy EW21, supported by PPG 2, states that development which is either infilling or redevelopment is considered to be appropriate within a major developed site in the greenbelt, provided it meets certain tests. The site being proposed for the hotel is greenfield, therefore this proposal cannot be considered to be for redevelopment.

To be considered infilling, the proposal would have to constitute "the filling of small gaps between built development" (annexe C2 PPG2). The presence of the

## List No. 14

adjacent Travelodge Hotel and Tulip Inn, along with the cargo buildings on the opposite side of Runger Lane adds weight to the argument that the site could be considered infill. In addition, if Avro Way had been extended, as is planned in the future, it may be argued that this site be defined as infill. However, as this site is still open to the north at present, i.e. an extended Avro Way does not run along the northern perimeter of the site, it is not believed that the proposed development could be considered to be purely infill development. In this case, policy EW21 goes on to state that if the proposed development accords with uses which are necessary for the operational efficiency and amenity of the Airport (the reasoned justification lists hotel accommodation), it must be judged against a test of very special circumstances as set out in policy E2.1 and PPG2.

PPG2 states that very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm done by the reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. When making a judgement on the harm caused by the proposal, the principle test must be whether the development preserves the openness of the Green Belt. A 7 storey hotel will by definition impact on the openness of the green belt and cause harm. However, given the siting of the Travelodge Hotel to the south of the site and the construction of the Tulip Inn to the west, whether the erection of an additional hotel in this location would further degrade the feeling of openness in this part of the Green Belt is open to question. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that the very special circumstances of economic need, which are outlined below, will outweigh any harm done to the openness of the Green Belt in this location.

The applicants have made a strong case, supported by supplementary documentation, that the proposed hotel, in a location such as this in close proximity to the airport, will be essential to the operational efficiency and amenity of the Airport and assist in enhancing the economic vitality of the region. There is no dispute that there is a need for hotels. The predicted growth in passenger numbers is well documented (37.8 million by 2014/15) and with that there will be a need for further hotels. The case for a further budget hotel, linked to forecast growth in budget airline traffic at the airport, is clearly made. A hotel would provide assistance to the economic vitality of the region as it would help support the growth of the airport, a regionally significant employer and attractor of inward investment. Enabling the expansion of the airport and its operational functions will allow the Airport to continue to be a principle driver of the Northern and city region economy.

It is considered, that any harm to openness would be outweighed by very special circumstances, i.e. the economic benefits, accordingly it is considered that the proposal would meet the tests of policy EW21 and E2.1 and be in accordance with the Manchester UDP.

**Nature Conservation** – As Great Crested Newts, which are known to occupy a pond in the adjoining field, are a European protected species under the European Habitats Directive and the Conservation (Nature Habitats and Conservation) Regulations 1994, the following questions must be answered before a recommendation can be made, i.e. would the proposal:

- kill any great crested newts, or
- disturb any of them, or
- destroy any of their eggs, or

## List No. 14

cause deterioration or destruction of a breeding site or resting place?

If the answer to any of these four points is yes then the following tests from the Habitat Directive must be applied:

- 1) Is the development "in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequence of primary for environment.
- 2) Is there is "no satisfactory alternative".
- 3) Is the derogation "not detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range".

As it is considered that the proposal has the potential to disturb the Great Crested Newts it is felt appropriate that the above three tests are applied in this instance.

Regarding test no. 1, it is believed that the applicants have provided sufficient information that the proposed development will be essential to the operational efficiency and amenity of the Airport and assist in enhancing the economic vitality of the region.

Regarding test no. 2, there are no sites within close proximity of the airport, being mindful of the findings of the EIP in respect of the draft RSS, that could house the proposal. The plot of land to the north of the application site is home to a known breeding pool for great crested newts, therefore relocation of the proposed hotel to this site would have a detrimental impact upon this existing habitat. The suggestion that the land at Thorley Lane (the Burford site) be used for hotel accommodation would be contrary to policy EW8 in the UDP which has seen it allocated as one of the major strategic sites in the City for high technology industry. It should be noted that outline consent for 50,185 m<sup>2</sup> of Class B1 business park has been granted on the Burford site in January 2007.

As any disturbance to the great crested newts can be mitigated by condition, it is considered that test no. 3 is also satisfied.

As Natural England have confirmed their acceptance of the applicants' mitigation proposals it is felt that the impact of the development upon the nearby Great Crested Newt population has been fully addressed. A condition requiring the implementation of the mitigation proposals prior to the commencement of the development is suggested.

**Impact on the Visual Amenities of the Green Belt** – PPG2 states that the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. Whilst the proposed development site is indisputably currently 'open' in the sense that it is not built upon, it has little sense of 'openness'. The parcel of land within which the site is located is almost entirely surrounded by development, i.e. by the under-construction Tulip Inn to the west, by the World Freight Terminal to the east and by the Travelodge building and other buildings associated with M56 Junction 6 interchange to the south. It has no visual connections to the countryside to the south or northwest and physical connections to the countryside involve crossing either a major road junction or crossing beneath a motorway. It is believed that

## List No. 14

the site provides neither a tranquil nor a high visual amenity environment/buffer between the World Freight Terminal and the settlement of Hale to the west.

Though the development would result in a moderately adverse impact upon the few close views into the site, primarily those from footpaths around the site, it is considered that tree planting in and around the site can, in the longer term, help to screen such views and break up the extent of frontage visible.

Opportunities for distant views of the development are relatively limited, due to the nature of the topography (land falls to the south) and enclosure by new development, settlement and vegetation. In distant views from the wider area, the hotel would appear adjacent to and within the context of other development of a similar scale. Views from distant viewpoints are mostly panoramic, meaning that a new structure would form a small component of the overall view. Views would be partially screened, with only upper storeys visible.

Though the construction of a 7 storey hotel will inevitably impact upon this particular element of the Green Belt given this site's location and the surrounding land uses and topography, it is not considered that the proposal will have a detrimental impact upon the visual amenities of the Green Belt as a whole.

**Access for Disabled People** – Level access into the hotel would be provided and 2 bedrooms per floor have been adapted for use by disabled guests. In addition, 7 disabled parking spaces are provided close to the hotel entrance. Overall this provision is considered acceptable.

**Design** – The design of the hotel is contemporary in nature and would utilise a mixture of traditional and more modern materials, that is masonry and composite metal cladding panels, topped by projecting metal eaves with the ground floor consisting primarily of glazing surrounded by hardwood boarding. In light of the above, the design of the hotel is considered acceptable.

**Siting** – The hotel would be sited in such a way so as to provide a street frontage to Runger Lane and the extended Avro Way. Given this, and the fact that the parking spaces would be located behind and to the side of the building, the siting of the hotel is considered acceptable.

**Highways Considerations** – As stated above, the proposed hotel would be provisionally accessed off Runger Lane, via the driveway which would serve the Travelodge Hotel, until the future extension of Avro Way has been completed. Once the extension works to Avro Way have been completed, the proposed hotel will have its own dedicated access point off this road.

**Access** – The access arrangements are considered acceptable.

**Travel Plan** – An appropriate condition will be imposed to ensure that the hotel operator, in conjunction with the Airport, provides appropriate transportation options to customers. Future upgrading of the road network will also include pedestrian links to the airport, although it is envisaged that the principle means of connection will be by bus.

**Parking Spaces** – The proposed level of parking, i.e. 126 spaces is acceptable.

## List No. 14

**Landscaping** – It is considered that the proposed landscaping, which includes the planting of 37 trees, is acceptable and will provide adequate screening and a good setting for the hotel. Tree pit details and protection measures for the existing hedge and trees adjacent to the adjacent Travelodge development have been received and they are being assessed. The comments of the Landscape Practice Group in respect of this matter will be reported to the Committee.

**BREEAM** – The pre-assessment estimator submitted by the applicants suggests that the development would achieve a BREEAM rating of “very good”. A condition will be attached requiring that this rating is achieved at the post construction stage.

**Renewable Energy** – The feasibility study has considered the viability of various renewable and low energy solutions for the Premier Travel Inn, Manchester Airport development.

A number of options including combined heat and power, solar collectors, ground source cooling & photo-voltaic cells were ruled out due to the nature, type and usage of this particular development.

Wind turbine technology, ground source heat pumps could be incorporated into the development although they are not financially viable due to the long pay back periods and the overall building carbon savings are low.

Biomass heating is a viable solution, however this would result in significant changes to the building form (ceiling voids, plantrooms, etc) and would in essence mean separate heating & cooling systems and the associated implications of implementing this technology.

It is considered that rainwater recovery is the most appropriate of the low energy solutions in this instance.

**Crime and Disorder** – The applicants will be required by condition to seek Secured by Design accreditation.

**Aerodrome Safeguarding** – The applicants have been requested to amend their landscaping scheme along the lines requested by the Aerodrome Safeguarding Officer. This is reflected in the recommendation.

**Town and Country Planning (Green Belt) Direction 2005** – As the proposal is inappropriate development and would involve construction of building with a floor space of more than 1000 square metres, the Council must consult the Secretary of State before being able to determine the application. The Secretary of State may decide to call the application in for his determination.

**Human Rights Act 1998 considerations** - This application needs to be considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Under Article 6, the applicants (and those third parties, including local residents, who have made representations) have the right to a fair hearing and to this end the Committee must give full consideration to their comments.

Protocol 1 Article 1, and Article 8 where appropriate, confer(s) a right of respect for a person's home, other land and business assets. In taking account of all

## List No. 14

material considerations, including Council policy as set out in the Unitary Development Plan, the Head of Planning has concluded that some rights conferred by these Articles on the applicant(s)/objectors/residents and other occupiers and owners of nearby land that might be affected may be interfered with but that that interference is in accordance with the law and justified by being in the public interest and on the basis of the planning merits of the development proposal. He believes that any restriction on these rights posed by approval of the application is proportionate to the wider benefits of approval and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

**Recommendation** **MINDED TO APPROVE** (subject to referral to the Secretary of State as a departure from the UDP; receipt of amended landscaping details) on the basis that the proposal is in accordance with the City Council's Unitary Development Plan, in particular policies H2.2, EW20, EW23, EW24, EW25, EW30 and E2.3 and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise.

### Conditions

1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason - Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority: \_\_\_\_\_

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Pursuant to policy H2.2 and policies EW20, EW23, EW24, EW25, EW30 and E2.3 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan.

3) No development that is hereby approved shall commence unless and until samples and specifications of all materials to be used on all external elevations of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The development shall be constructed only using the approved materials unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable to the City Council as local planning authority in the interests of the visual amenity of the area within which the site is located, as specified in policy EW25 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

4) The car parking facilities shall be surfaced, demarcated and made available for use prior to the building hereby approved being occupied. The car park shall then be available at all times whilst the site is occupied.

## List No. 14

### Reason

To ensure that there is adequate car parking for the development proposed when the building is occupied pursuant to Policy T2.4 of the Manchester UDP.

5) Temporary vehicular access to the completed hotel development shall be taken from Runger Lane, via the existing Travelodge driveway, until the future extension to Avro Way has been undertaken. Thereafter, vehicular access to the hotel hereby approved shall be taken from the extended Avro Way.

### Reason

To ensure a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety, pursuant to Policy T2.1 and T2.2 in the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester

6) The hard and soft landscaping scheme approved by the City Council as local planning authority shown on drawing ref \_\_\_\_\_, shall be implemented not later than 12 months from the date of commencement of works. If within a period of 5 years from the date of the planting of any tree or shrub, that tree or shrub or any tree or shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, or becomes, in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - To ensure that a satisfactory landscaping scheme for the development is carried out that respects the character and visual amenities of the area, in accordance with policy EW24 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

7) In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree, shrub or hedge which is to be as shown as retained on the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of 5 years from the date of the occupation of the building for its permitted use.

(a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the local planning authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 5387 (Trees in relation to construction)

(b) If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.

(c) The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and particulars before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground

## List No. 14

levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the local planning authority.

Reason - In order avoid damage to trees/shrubs adjacent to and within the site which are of important amenity value to the area and in order to protect the character of the area, in accordance with Policies E2.4, E2.6 and EW24 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

8) A scheme for the removal of Starling, Corvid and Pigeon roosts and rookeries, and the pruning of plant species which bear potential food sources for birds shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development. The approved scheme shall be implemented and shall remain in force for so long as the development is occupied.

Reason - In order to minimise the potential for bird hazard strikes at Manchester Airport, pursuant to the Town and Country Planning (Safeguarding Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas) Direction 2002.

9) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, the Great Crested Newt mitigation proposals approved by Natural England shall be implemented in full with any alterations being first agreed in writing with the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason

To ensure the protection of habitat of Great Crested Newts which are protected species under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, pursuant to Policy E2.3 of the Manchester UDP.

10) Before development commences a scheme for the extraction of any fumes, vapours and odours from any kitchen areas within the development hereby approved shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the City Council as Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers nearby properties, pursuant to Policy H2.2 in the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester

11) The premises/building shall be insulated against aircraft noise in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority before the use commences. The approved noise insulation scheme shall be completed before any of the accommodation is occupied. The internal noise criteria required are stated in British Standard 8233:1999 as being:

Reasonable conditions for study and work requiring concentration (cellular office):

-good design: \_40dB Laeq, T

-reasonable design: \_50dB Laeq, T

Reasonable acoustic privacy in shared spaces (open plan office):

## List No. 14

- design range: 45 to 50 dB Laeq, T

Reason - In view of the proximity of the development to Manchester International Airport and in the interests of the amenity of future occupiers of the property in accordance with policy EW4 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan.

12) Before the development hereby approved commences a scheme for the storage and disposal of refuse shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority. The details of the approved scheme shall be implemented as part of the development and shall remain in situ whilst the use or development is in operation.

Reason

In the interests of amenity and public health, pursuant to Policy H2.2 in the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester

13) No part of the development shall be occupied until space and facilities for bicycle parking have been provided in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. These facilities shall then be retained and permanently reserved for bicycle parking.

Reason

To ensure that adequate provision is made for bicycle parking so that persons occupying or visiting the development have a range of options in relation to mode of transport pursuant to Policy T3.1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

14) The development shall not be occupied unless accreditation, confirming achievement of the Secured by Design standards in respect of the development has been issued by Greater Manchester Police, unless otherwise agreed in writing by City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - To reduce the risk of crime pursuant to Policy E3.5 of the Unitary Development Plan of the City of Manchester and to reflect the guidance contained in Planning Policy Statement "Delivering Sustainable Development".

15) The development hereby approved shall achieve a post-construction Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) rating of 'very good' or 'excellent' and at least three star sustainability rating under the code for sustainable homes for those elements of the development which are residential in nature. A post construction review certificate shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority before any of the buildings hereby approved are first occupied.

Reason - In order to minimise the environmental impact of the development pursuant to policies E1.5 and E1.6 in the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, policies ER13 and DP3 of Regional Planning Guidance for the North West (RPG13) and the principles contained within The Guide to Development in Manchester 2 SPD and Planning Policy Statement 1.

## List No. 14

16) Details of a Travel Plan Strategy, implementation and details of monitoring of effectiveness shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority prior to the hotel hereby permitted first being brought into use. The strategy shall outline procedures and policies that the developer and occupants of the site will adopt to secure the objectives of the overall site's Travel Plan Strategy. Additionally, the strategy shall outline the monitoring procedures and review mechanisms that are to be put in place to ensure that the strategy and its implementation remains effective. The results of the monitoring and review processes shall be submitted in writing to the local planning authority and any measures that are identified that can improve the effectiveness of the Travel Plan Strategy shall be adopted and implemented.

Reason - In order to promote sustainable modes of transportation, in accordance with the provisions contained within Planning Policy Guidance 13.

17) The wheels of contractors vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned and the access roads leading to the site swept daily in accordance with a management scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority prior to any works commencing on site.

Reason - In the interest of pedestrian and highway safety, as specified in policy H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

### **Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

The documents referred to in the course of this report are either contained in the file(s) relating to application ref: 082694/FO/2007/S2 held by Planning or are City Council planning policies, the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, national planning guidance documents, or relevant decisions on other applications or appeals, copies of which are all held by the Planning Division.

### **The following residents, businesses and other third parties in the area were consulted/notified on the application:**

Greater Manchester Police  
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit  
Manchester Airport Safeguarding Officer  
Natural England  
Travel Lodge, Rungler Lane, Manchester, M90 5DL  
444 Hale Road, Manchester, WA158TH  
Flat 1- 10 The Green, 438 Hale Road, Manchester, WA158TH  
399-456 Hale Road, Manchester, WA158TH  
399 Hale Road, Manchester, WA158XX  
7, 11-17, 23 Brooks Drive, Manchester, WA158TL  
6-10, 14-16, 26-50 Brooks Drive, Manchester, WA158TN  
399-415, 452-482 Hale Road, Manchester, WA158XR  
Brookfield, Hasty Lane, Manchester, WA158UU  
Garden House, Hasty Lane, Manchester, WA158UU  
High Sierra, Hasty Lane, Manchester, WA158UU  
White Piers, Hasty Lane, Manchester, WA158UU  
Fern Cottage, Hale Road, Manchester, WA158XN  
Hale Barns Cricket Club, Brooks Drive, Manchester, WA158TW

**List No. 14**

The Bungalow, Hasty Lane, Manchester, WA158UU  
Oak Croft, Hasty Lane, Manchester, WA158UU  
Ring-a-roses, Hasty Lane, Manchester, WA158UT  
1a, Hasty Lane, Manchester, WA158UU  
Manchester Airport Marriott, Hale Road, Manchester, WA158XW  
30-32 Brooks Drive, Manchester, WA158TR

various airport related business at Manchester Airport and the World freight Centre

**Representations were received from the following third parties:**

Mrs Maureen O'Callaghan, Flat 8, The Greens, 438 Hale Road, Manchester  
Greater Manchester Police  
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit  
Manchester Airport Safeguarding Officer  
Natural England

**Relevant Contact Officer:** : David Lawless  
**Telephone No.** : (0161) 234 4543  
**Email** : d.lawless@manchester.gov.uk