

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2017**

**Present:** Councillor Ellison (Chair).

**Councillors:** Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Barrett, Chohan, Curley, Dar, Fender, Kamal, Madeleine Monaghan, Paul, Siddiqi and Watson.

**Apologies:** Councillors: Ahmed Ali.

**Also present:** Councillors: Davies, N. Murphy.

#### **PH/17/1 Minutes**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2016 as a correct record.

#### **PH/17/2 113852/FO/2016 - 30 Hulme High Street, Manchester, M15 5JS.**

Members recalled that a committee site visit was undertaken prior to the previous committee meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2016. At that meeting Members were minded to refuse the related application on the grounds of parking, noise impacts, litter and disamenity from the proposed use and activity outside the premises. Members requested that officers bring the applications back to Committee with potential reasons for refusal based on those matters for further consideration.

The applicant has provided a further supporting statement, detailed in the late representations which seeks to address the concerns raised by members at that meeting.

Highway Services have reviewed the application following the meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> December and provided a further assessment detailed in the report that concluded a reason for refusal based on parking concerns could not be sustained.

Officers have reviewed the comments of Environmental Health who have also assessed additional information provided by the applicant. Environmental Health raise no objection to the proposals in relation to noise or disamenity caused by the air conditioning units. It is considered that the addition of an acoustic insulation condition could be reasonably attached to a decision to overcome these concerns and would not be a reason to refuse the application. Environmental Health have confirmed that the technical information provided by the applicant with respect to the air conditioning units is acceptable and should be installed in accordance with the details supplied.

It is also not considered that the proposed use would generate a significant increase in the amount or types of litter generated than would be the case by other occupiers that could lawfully operate from this commercial unit.

A representative of local residents spoke to the Committee and reiterated their concerns with regard to parking, noise impacts, litter and disamenity from the proposed use and activity outside the premises, as well as the loss of a retail unit from the area.

Local residents concerns were supported by a Ward Councillor who reiterated that the proposals were inappropriate for this particular location.

The proposed application for a change of use from A1 retail to a betting shop (*sui generis*) has been fully considered against the relevant planning policies. On balance the Committee determined that the proposal would not adversely impact on the vitality of Hulme district centre nor would it cause harm to the amenities of local residents living in and adjacent to the Hulme district centre.

### **Decision**

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representations.

### **PH/17/3      113853/FO/2016 - 30 Hulme High Street, Manchester, M15 5JS.**

Members recalled that a committee site visit was undertaken prior to the previous committee meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2016. At that meeting Members were minded to refuse the related application on the grounds of parking, noise impacts, litter and disamenity from the proposed use and activity outside the premises. Members requested that officers bring the applications back to Committee with potential reasons for refusal based on those matters for further consideration.

The applicant has provided a further supporting statement, detailed in the late representations which seeks to address the concerns raised by members at that meeting.

Highway Services have reviewed the application following the meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> December and provided a further assessment detailed in the report that concluded a reason for refusal based on parking concerns could not be sustained.

Officers have reviewed the comments of Environmental Health who have also assessed additional information provided by the applicant. Environmental Health raise no objection to the proposals in relation to noise or disamenity caused by the air conditioning units. It is considered that the addition of an acoustic insulation condition could be reasonably attached to a decision to overcome these concerns and would not be a reason to refuse the application. Environmental Health have confirmed that the technical information provided by the applicant with respect to the air conditioning units is acceptable and should be installed in accordance with the details supplied.

It is also not considered that the proposed use would generate a significant increase in the amount or types of litter generated than would be the case by other occupiers that could lawfully operate from this commercial unit.

A representative of local residents spoke to the Committee and reiterated their concerns with regard to parking, noise impacts, litter and disamenity from the proposed use and activity outside the premises, as well as the loss of a retail unit from the area.

Local residents concerns were supported by a Ward Councillor who reiterated that the proposals were inappropriate for this particular location.

The proposed application for the installation of a new shop front and elevational alterations to the rear has been fully considered against the relevant planning policies. On balance the Committee determined that the proposal would not adversely impact on the vitality of Hulme district centre nor would it cause harm to the amenities of local residents living in and adjacent to the Hulme district centre.

### **Decision**

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representations.

### **PH/17/4      113855/FO/2016 - 30 Hulme High Street, Manchester, M15 5JS.**

Members recalled that a committee site visit was undertaken prior to the previous committee meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2016. At that meeting Members were minded to refuse the related application on the grounds of parking, noise impacts, litter and disamenity from the proposed use and activity outside the premises. Members requested that officers bring the applications back to Committee with potential reasons for refusal based on those matters for further consideration.

The applicant has provided a further supporting statement, detailed in the late representations which seeks to address the concerns raised by members at that meeting.

Highway Services have reviewed the application following the meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> December and provided a further assessment detailed in the report that concluded a reason for refusal based on parking concerns could not be sustained.

Officers have reviewed the comments of Environmental Health who have also assessed additional information provided by the applicant. Environmental Health raise no objection to the proposals in relation to noise or disamenity caused by the air conditioning units. It is considered that the addition of an acoustic insulation condition could be reasonably attached to a decision to overcome these concerns and would not be a reason to refuse the application. Environmental Health have confirmed that the technical information provided by the applicant with respect to the air conditioning units is acceptable and should be installed in accordance with the details supplied.

It is also not considered that the proposed use would generate a significant increase in the amount or types of litter generated than would be the case by other occupiers that could lawfully operate from this commercial unit.

A representative of local residents spoke to the Committee and reiterated their concerns with regard to parking, noise impacts, litter and disamenity from the proposed use and activity outside the premises, as well as the loss of a retail unit from the area.

Local residents concerns were supported by a Ward Councillor who reiterated that the proposals were inappropriate for this particular location.

The proposed application for the installation of 3no satellite dishes and 2no air conditioning units to the roof has been fully considered against the relevant planning policies. On balance the Committee determined that the proposal would not adversely impact on the vitality of Hulme district centre nor would it cause harm to the amenities of local residents living in and adjacent to the Hulme district centre.

### **Decision**

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representations.

#### **PH/17/5      114349/FO/2016 – Peter Ashley Car Parks Limited, Irvin Drive, Manchester M22 5LR.**

This application was presented to the Committee following the determination of an earlier application 112323/FO/2016/S2, which was refused by the Committee on the 25<sup>th</sup> August 2016. The application was reported to the Committee in that instance due to the absence of a Wythenshawe Area Committee in the month of August 2016. The reasons for refusal were as follows:

1. The scale and massing of the development proposed would cause harm to residential amenity by virtue of providing an overbearing structure, contrary to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The increase in coming and going of vehicles and increase in the numbers of vehicles within the application site will lead to noise disturbance that would cause harm to the residential amenities of surrounding property, contrary to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy, saved policy DC26 of the Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The design of the development proposal constitutes an overly dominant incongruous structure in the street scene to the detriment of the visual amenity and character of the area, by virtue of the height and extent of the building, particularly along Styal Road contrary to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Officers provided further information regarding additional assessment of revisions to the submitted acoustic report by Environmental Health, who have recommended that should permission be granted, further conditions regarding the installation of gates designed to reduce noise and restrictions on the use of car parking spaces 25 metres or less from residential properties should be considered.

The applicant spoke to the Committee stating that the proposals would meet a clear need for additional parking at the Airport, and that there were no technical reasons for refusal outlined by any of the consultees. In addition the applicant stated that the existing use of the site as a car park and the designation of the site as in an area for employment provision rather than residential development made this an ideal site the type of development proposed. The applicant also detailed the amendments made to the original proposals which they considered addressed the issues raised and the prior reasons for refusal.

The Committee carefully considered the report and the representations, and while they acknowledged the applicants claim that they had attempted to overcome the three reasons for refusal for the original application, they did not consider that the alterations sufficiently addressed the reasons for refusal.

### **Decision**

To refuse to grant the application for the reasons contained in the report.

#### **PH/17/6      114294/VO/2016 and 114370/LO/2016 - Starlight Theatre, Water Street.**

These planning applications are for the demolition of the Starlight theatre and other buildings and structures (formerly part of ITV Granada Studios), the restoration and reuse of the Grade II Listed Colonnaded Railway Viaduct and a new building of approx. 13,500 sq. m. The building would be a flexible performing arts space known as The Factory Manchester and could potentially become the permanent home for the Manchester International Festival.

Factory would have four main parts: the theatre; the warehouse; back of house towers and; the foyer. There would also be associated facilities such as retail, bar and cloakrooms, potential temporary or pop-up food and drink offer and support space, offices and dressing rooms. Two new public spaces called Factory Square and Festival Square would be created around the new building.

Officers confirmed that there was a commitment to re-examine the proposals for Coach parking in the vicinity of the venue, and acknowledged that this was a valid concern raised by some of the consultees.

The applicant spoke to the Committee in support of the proposals, and said that this was a unique opportunity to provide a world class Arts facility for both Manchester and the wider region. The applicant said that the quality of the proposals was very clearly laid out in the report, and the benefits that would be provided should permission be granted were clear.

An Elected Member also spoke to the Committee and said that they supported and welcomed the proposed development, but still had concerns that the proposals for Coach parking would lead to increased noise disturbance, pollution and disamenity.

She requested that this issue be addressed and resolved before the venue was operational.

After taking legal advice, officers agreed that an additional condition requiring a strategy for coach parking to be submitted within 6 months of the grant of any permission would be acceptable in this case.

The Committee welcomed the proposed development, and agreed that the issues with coach parking that had been raised were part of a wider challenge across the city centre, and while being relevant to this application, this applicant could not be required to address a city wide problem. The Committee asked that the issues raised by this application with regard to coach parking be looked at in a wider context by officers outside the scope of this meeting.

### **Decision**

To grant the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and with an additional condition requiring the applicant to submit a strategy for the provision of coach parking within 6 months of the date of the grant of permission.

#### **PH/17/7      113870/FO/2016/ - 2 – 4 Chester Road, Manchester, M15 4QG**

The Committee received a request for a site visit, and considered that it would be appropriate in this case.

### **Decision**

To conduct a site visit on 9 February 2017.

#### **PH/17/8      112256/FO/2016 – Land bounded by Great Ancoats Street, Henry Street, Gun Street and Blossom Street, Manchester M4 5AE**

The application site is approximately 0.24 hectares and is located within the Ancoats Conservation Area and is opposite the Stevenson Square Conservation Area. The site is bounded by Great Ancoats Street, Henry Street, Gun Street and Blossom Street.

The site consists of two plots of land which are separated by Gun Street, the road that runs between the two plots:

- Plot A (to the south) – Land bounded by Great Ancoats Street, Blossom Street and Gun Street. The plot currently comprises vacant land (used as a surface level car park), a former substation (with its distinctive bird art work to the side elevation) and a single storey garage;
- Plot B (to the north) – Land bounded by Henry Street, Blossom Street and Gun Street. The plot currently comprises part single, part two storey buildings which are currently used for storage purposes.

The owner of a neighbouring property and another interested party spoke to the Committee in objection to the proposed development, and reiterated their

concerns which are summarised in the report and the late representation. In particular the concerns relating to overlooking and the loss of light to adjoining buildings were highlighted. In addition, residents raised concerns that the proposals were in contravention of several current policies relating to development in the City.

The applicant spoke to the Committee and whilst acknowledging the concerns raised by residents, pointed out that these had been comprehensively addressed in the report and resolved by the addition of relevant conditions.

Officer acknowledged the strength of feeling associated with the loss of the substation and agreed that this has resulted in a large number of representations concerning its impact on the heritage value and significance of the Conservation Area, which are summarised in the report. It is considered that appropriate consideration has been given to the buildings demolition and the associated impacts on the significance of the Conservation Area. It should be noted that Historic England have not raised any objections to the loss of the building and have welcomed the addition of a high quality building to the local area.

Revised plans had also been submitted which were included in the late representation and placed before Committee for consideration. In addition, for the reasons given in the report, it is considered that the proposal is consistent with the policies contained within the Core Strategy.

The Committee requested clarification that the concerns detailed in the report from Manchester Conservation Areas and Historic Building Panel and Historic England had been addressed, and officers confirmed the details of changes to the initial proposals that had addressed the concerns raised, including lowering the height of building to the part of the site not bordering Great Ancoats Street to bring the development more in line with existing buildings, reconsidering the materials to be used and reconsidering some of the design features. Officers also confirmed that despite resident's concerns, the space specifications of each unit did comply with current residential guidelines.

After consideration, the Committee considered the proposal would act as a catalyst in the regeneration of the Ancoats area as it would deliver a high quality residential led mixed use development. High quality apartments in this location would provide a range of housing choice within the private rental market. Consideration was given to the impact of the development on the historic environment, particularly the nearby Listed Buildings and Ancoats Conservation Area.

## **Decision**

**opprovetheTo Approve** the application subject to the condition and reasons set out in the report and late representation.

**PH/17/9      112487/FO/2016 – Formal Church of St Jerome, Rylance Street,  
Bradford, Manchester M11 3NB**

The application site is located on Rylance Street and Stadium Drive in the Beswick area of Manchester, approximately 3.3km east of the City Centre. The application site measures approximately 0.51 hectares in size and includes the existing highway

of Ferry Street and the former Church of St Jerome building. The church building has been vacant for some period of time and has fallen into a poor state of disrepair.

The proposal will see the redevelopment of a brownfield site where the site is currently vacant, within the heart of one of Manchester's key regeneration areas. A total of 23 new dwellinghouses will be created which will contribute to the City's residential growth strategy and help support neighbourhoods of choice. Careful consideration has been given to the siting, scale and appearance of the development to ensure it provide a high quality development along with minimising the impact on existing residents. Matters of car parking, cycle parking, highways, noise, ecology, flood risk and sustainability have all been considered along with ground conditions, designing out crime and waste management.

### **Decision**

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representation.

### **PH/17/10      110923/FO/2016 – Former Garratt Hotel Pink Bank Lane, Longsight, Manchester, M12 5RF.**

This application relates to a detached 2 storey building which sits centrally in a corner site, and is surrounded by hard surfacing. The site lies in a predominantly residential area, with housing to the north and south and a nursing home to the west, with some industrial units to the east.

In August 2013 planning permission was granted for the change of use of former public house to Class D1 community centre and prayer Hall which would also include educational classes (102887/FU/2013/N2). Some minor external alterations were also proposed, including a small, 0.4 metre long single storey extension to the existing front entrance, to provide a new entrance to the building, a new door in the side elevation, a roof alteration to an existing single storey part of the building and other aesthetic improvements. The internal alterations included creating dedicated prayer spaces, multi-use rooms and teaching spaces. The hours of operation, approved at that time were:

Monday to Friday - 8.00 am to 9.00 pm and Saturday, Sunday and Bank Holidays - 9.00 am to 8.00pm.

The premises are now operational and it is now proposed to erect a single storey extension to the property. The building currently has an irregular shape with projecting elements to the front side and rear. It is proposed to give the building a more regular shape to give a larger prayer room and rearrange the existing facilities. The extensions would, in effect, 'square-off' the northern and western boundaries of the building, with the extensions coming no further forward than the existing forward most points of the building. The existing building has a floorspace of 526 square metres and the proposal would result in an extra 187 square metres of floorspace being created. In addition to the single storey element three domed features are proposed at the front of the building.



The Committee considered the report and all of the representations, and determined that whilst some additional vehicle movements may take place as a result of this proposal, between 5pm and 7pm Monday to Friday, the facility is essentially proposed to meet a local demand, and, other than at Friday prayer, the levels of activity at the site are unlikely to be detrimental to surrounding residents.

Undoubtedly there will be activity and demand for car parking at the site, particularly during Friday prayer. However, it is not considered that this proposal would significantly add to the existing demand. Furthermore peak demand for parking (i.e. Friday prayers) will not be at a time when residential demand, for car parking, is at its peak. The conditions requested by Highways Services should ensure any impact on on-street parking, and residential amenity, would be kept to a minimum, and as such the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this location.

### **Decision**

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report.

### **PH/17/11      113618/FO/2016 – Land to the South of Chapel Street, Manchester, M19 3QB**

This planning application relates to the former Buffoline Industrial Estate and Atlas Mill. The application site is bounded by Elbow Street (west), Chapel Street (north) and Stanhope Street. The application site covers an area of 0.68 hectares. Beyond the southern boundary is the grounds of the St. Mary's RC Church, Presbytery and parish centre, which are accessed via Elbow Street. The application site is situated in close proximity to Levenshulme District Centre but is within an area dominated by residential uses interspersed with historically established industrial uses.

The applicant spoke in support of their application, explaining that this was a challenging site to develop, but that they had worked closely with officers to produce an acceptable proposal, and that the benefits of the proposed development were referred to at length in the officer's report.

Within each of the proposed house types the rear elevations would incorporate contrasting buff brick; a detail applied also the apartment block. Further continuity would be secured through the use of grey metal window frames throughout the development. Access to rear bin store to housing would be secured through a shared access arrangement adjacent to the side elevations of proposed houses. Garages with pitched roofs and sited in double and single unit configurations would be positioned adjacent to the curtilages to house type D.

The Committee carefully considered the report and all of the representations, and considered that the proposed development offers the opportunity to improve and increase housing choice in Levenshulme and remove issues associated with the sites existing condition.

### **Decision**

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representations and to delegate to the Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing in consultation with the Chair to agree a minor rewording of conditions 3 and 17.

**PH/17/12 113298/FO/2016 – North Manchester Business Park Land at Brightside, Crumpsall, Manchester**

The application site relates to a section of land forming part of North Manchester Business Park also known as the former Old Blackley works.

The application site is bounded by the remainder of a wider site along its eastern boundary, flanked by the River Irk with residential properties beyond. The western perimeter of the site is adjoined by a large swathe of vegetation, which due to the topography of the land, sits at a lower level to the site of North Manchester General Hospital.

The northern part of the site adjoins another business park, whilst to the south is a recent residential development comprising an estate of dwellinghouses and a paper waste recycling depot situated on the corner of Waterloo Street and Brightside Road. Access to the site is achieved via an access spur off a roundabout along Brightside Road and was constructed as part of a previous permission.

The application seeks planning permission for the use of the site for the temporary storage of vehicles associated with the operations of Salford Van Hire Ltd. The facility which will not be open to the public will be used to store various trailers and rigid vehicles during the 'down periods' of the business. Typically, between March and September each year.

The application as originally submitted proposed a temporary, two year period to operate on a 24 hours basis. However, due to concerns surrounding the temporary use of the land and potential disturbance, the proposal has been revised to allow for a 12 month temporary period and to operate between the hours of 7am – 7pm. The applicant has also set out a commitment to bring forward a comprehensive development of the wider site which will be the subject of a S106 agreement.

The Committee carefully considered the report and all of the representations. On balance, the Committee considered that the proposed temporary use will not result in significant impact upon either residential or visual amenity, or upon the operation of the local highway network.

**Decision**

Minded to approve subject to a S.106 agreement relating to the comprehensive development of the wider site, and subject to the conditions and for the reasons set out in the report and late representation.