

## **NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 29 APRIL 2015**

### **UPDATE TO AGENDA**

**APPLICATION NO: 15/0283M**

**LOCATION Lode Hill, Altrincham Road, Styal**

**UPDATE PREPARED 27 April 2015**

### **CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

**Highways** – objection raised to the proposal due to concerns about the amount of parking proposed.

### **OFFICER APPRAISAL**

As stated above, a consultation response has now been received from the highways department who have provided the following comments:

#### ***Traffic Assessment and Infrastructure***

*There is no Transport Statement submitted with the application although in consideration of the traffic impact of the development the application is acceptable. The site already has a considerable level of airport parking that will have traffic movements associated with it which will be removed in this planning application, the proposed new hotel in daily general operation would not add sufficient additional traffic movements to the local highway network to warrant a traffic impact reason for refusal.*

*The existing access point will be retained to the site and the gates are to be positioned further back into the access to provide improved storage space for vehicles to wait off the highway. The internal layout of the site would be private and the access splits into two separate accesses to provide access to the car parks. The servicing will take place to the rear of the building.*

#### ***Car Parking***

*In total there are 37 car parking spaces proposed for the Hotel, the applicant has stated that the number of car parking spaces has been kept to a minimum given the sustainable location of the site. Given the rural location of the site, it is my view that trips to and from the site will be car dominated and very few guests, if any, will arrive by non car modes. The footway network is limited there is a footway on one side of Altrincham Road only and there is no footway at all close to the site. Additionally, there are no footways provided internally within the site. In regards to car parking numbers, 37 spaces for 35 bedrooms may have been considered acceptable although account needs to be taken of the ancillary uses that the hotel will have such as restaurant/bar,*

*health spa, offices and potentially a wedding venue. There are no details provided of the number of staff that will be employed at the site and clearly provision for staff parking within the site is an important consideration.*

### **Summary and Conclusion**

*Given the existing use of the site, the proposed change to a hotel of this scale is an acceptable use in highway terms as it does not have a material traffic impact on the local highway network. Whilst, the applicant is of the view that this is a readily accessible site to non car modes, it is likely that the vast majority of trips will be car based given the rural location of the site and that staff will travel to the site by car. This is a large site and further car parking can be provided within the site if necessary but given the current plan submitted I would have to raise objections on the grounds of lack of car parking.*

Given the concerns raised with regard to parking numbers, it is proposed that an additional reason for refusal be attached to the original recommendation relating to inadequate parking provision.

It is also worth noting that whilst there is space within the site to provide additional parking as required by highways, this would have a knock on impact on the Green Belt and on the visual amenity of the area. Any need to provide additional parking would therefore add further weight to the original Green Belt objection to the proposal.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The original recommendation of **REFUSAL** remains with an additional highways reason for refusal due to inadequate parking facilities being provided for the proposed hotel and associated facilities.