

From: publicaccess@trafford.gov.uk
Sent: 16 Jul 2021 12:34:29 +0100
To: Development Management (Planning)
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 105019/FUL/21

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 12:34 PM on 16 Jul 2021 from Mr Howard Lloyd.

Application Summary

Address: Meadowgate Farm Cob Kiln Lane Urmston M41 9JT
Proposal: Erection of children's nursery with associated parking and play areas, following demolition of existing buildings and stables (revised application following withdrawal of 103260/FUL/21)
Case Officer: Tom Parkinson

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mr Howard Lloyd
Email: [REDACTED]
Address: 19 Meadowgate, Urmston M41 9LB

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour
Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment: - Please provide details
Comments: Planning Application number: 105019/FUL/21

I strongly object to this planning application for the following reasons

1) Green Belt

The location is designated Green Belt. Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) is concerned with Protecting Green Belt Land. At paragraph 145 it states that 'a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt'. Although the section does allow for the replacement of an existing building, this is only when 'the new building is in the same use as the one it replaces'. The planning application does not meet this condition.

2) Flood Plain

The location is categorized as a Flood Plain by the Environment Agency. Their flood maps also show that the location is in an area not benefitting from flood defences. Widespread damage from recent weather patterns have demonstrated that building on

flood plains is to be avoided. In fact the Head of the Environment Agency has said he would insist that development should only be considered when there is no alternative, and where it does not affect flood risk elsewhere. I enclose a photograph taken this year of the location completely under water. I believe it amply shows the folly of the proposed development.

3) Traffic

The development would adversely affect highway safety and the convenience of road users. The stretch of Cob Kiln lane leading from Meadow Road to the location is a narrow road. It cannot be widened. The eastern side of the road is a protected public footpath enjoyed by a large number of walkers and cyclists throughout the day effectively making this a one way lane. However a bigger problem would be Meadow Road. Although this may appear to be a two way road on a map, in practice cars park on both sides of the road making this also a one way carriageway. I enclose photographs supporting this comment. Already residents on Meadow Road and Meadowgate face difficulty getting to their homes and on many occasions delivery vans have been unable to reach their destination. The proposed development would make this far worse and would adversely impact safety for residents, walkers, cyclists and of course infants, coming and going to the proposed Nursery.

Traffic chaos could be the result of this proposal being approved, and, although this may be at certain times of the day, two other safety concerns are bottlenecks on Meadow Road causing a tail back on Stretford Road, and the ability of emergency vehicles to be able to attend call outs promptly. The transport document submitted by the applicant estimates additional traffic on the premise that many infants and parents live within walking distance. This may not be the case because it is quite normal for parents to take infants to nursery on their way driving to work. However if the applicant's document is correct, this would strongly argue for a pavement on Cob Kiln Lane on safety grounds, and the Council should be aware of the risk of a proposal for numbers of vehicles together with nursery infants on foot on an unmarked lane with no pavement.

4) Contaminated Land

It appears from a report, prepared by Trafford Council in March 2020, the location is considered at risk from former industrial use with potential sources of ground gas (methane and carbon dioxide), heavy metal and hydrocarbons being present. This does not seem to be a safe environment for any development let alone a Nursery for up to 125 infants.

5) Noise

The Proposal is for a nursery of 125 infants. Offsted guidelines are that infants should be outdoors whenever they can be. 125 infants can make a lot of noise - and this would really disturb the peace and quiet enjoyed by the surrounding neighbourhood.