

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 9 February 2017

Present: Councillor Ellison (Chair).

Councillors: Ahmed Ali, Shaukat Ali, Barrett, Chohan, Curley, Dar, Fender, Kamal, Paul, Siddiqi and Watson.

Apologies: Councillors: Nasrin Ali and Madeleine Monaghan.

Also present: Councillors: Davies, Hacking, Leech.

PH/17/13 Minutes

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2017 as a correct record.

PH/17/14 112528/FO/2016/N2 - 863-871 Stockport Road, Levenshulme Manchester M19 3PW.

Members recalled that this planning application was deferred from consideration by the Planning and Highways Committee at its meeting on 20 October 2016 so that further supporting information could be submitted with regard to waste management, the impact of additional car parking and the loss of an A1 Retail unit.

This planning application was amended during its consideration and it was necessary to undertake a series of re-consultation with local residents and other interested parties in respect of the detail of the proposed amended development.

The reconsultation showed that many residents maintained that, despite changes to the description of the proposed development, Hot Food Takeaway (HFTA) facilities would still be available from the application premises. As a result, the previously expressed concerns and objections were not withdrawn.

The report to Committee concluded that the development would not unduly affect residential amenity or wider character of the area and any potentially harmful impact could be managed through conditions, and that where appropriate conditions have been amended in response to concerns previously expressed by members. Conditions have also been recommended to ensure the proposed ground floor units would only be used as a restaurant and café respectively (Class A3).

A local resident spoke to the Committee and said that despite the concerns raised by objectors, there were several positive aspects to the proposed development, and that as a resident living in close proximity to the premises he would welcome the proposals. He said that the concerns raised about excess litter generation were spurious, as in his personal experience there was no more rubbish generated in the area than in the City Centre, especially since additional bins had been installed in the last year. Further he said that the existing HFTA were responsible operators, and that as far as he could see the majority of their products were consumed inside the premises, further reducing the potential for litter on the streets. From a public safety

perspective, in his experience the parts of Stockport Road that did not have any HFTA could be dark and intimidating late in the evening, and that he was in favour of getting the shops lit-up and open, which would have the result of improving public safety and security.

His final point was to say that there was ample parking in the immediate vicinity of the premises, and that the additional traffic that would be generated by a premises of the nature proposed would be negligible.

The Committee clarified the methodology used to calculate the amount of waste that would be generated by the premises, but were generally content to grant the application.

Decision

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

(Councillor Siddiqi was not present for part of this application so took no part in the decision.)

PH/17/15 114430/FO/2016 - University Of Manchester Oxford Road Manchester M13 9PL.

A planning application 114430/FO/2016 for the construction of a new building for higher education purposes including laboratory spaces, offices, meeting rooms, research collaboration space (Use Class D1) together with ancillary public realm and landscaping, storage, new servicing arrangements and associated highway and engineering works was received.

The application site is within the University of Manchester campus and comprises an area of grassed land, containing a number of trees, which is 0.55 hectares. It is bounded by Upper Brook Street, the Alan Turing Building, the university campus and a multi-storey NCP car park to the north. The immediate area of the site comprises a mix of uses including University buildings and privately owned commercial buildings.

Planning Permission is sought for the construction of a ten-storey building for higher education, including laboratory spaces, offices, meeting rooms, research collaboration space (Use Class D1), together with ancillary landscaping, servicing and associated highway and engineering works.

A Committee Members requested clarification as to the arrangements for the replacement of trees, especially mature trees, which would be removed due to the development. Officers responded that the loss of trees would be compensated by new tree planting on the site and the wider University Campus on a ratio of 2:1. Officers also confirmed that conditions attached to any permission granted would ensure that suitable replacement planting would be implemented within an appropriate timescale. In addition, it was confirmed that there were a number of regeneration frameworks in place across the university corridor which relate to the

wider campus and individual developments that assured the inclusion of public space and green infrastructure.

Decision

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

PH/17/16 113870/FO/2016 - 2 - 4 Chester Road Manchester M15 4QG.

The Committee recalled that consideration of this application was deferred at the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on 12 January 2017 to enable a site visit to take place. The site visit was completed in the morning of 9 February 2017.

The proposal is for the erection of two residential buildings (Blocks A and B) to provide 188 apartments (78 in Block A and 110 in Block B). The buildings would sit on a 5m-5.5m high plinth that would be constructed between the towpath and Chester Road. Block A would be situated on the south western part of the site, adjacent to the Castlegate apartment building, and Block B would be situated on the north eastern part of the site. There would be a gap at the upper levels between the two buildings, with a single storey glazed lobby at ground floor that would link them and create the main entrance into the development off Chester Road (following removal of the existing brick wall and part of the stone wall on the Chester Road frontage). A vehicular drop off point would be created in front of Building A to allow access directly from Chester Road.

A representative of Castlefield Estates Ltd spoke on behalf of residents and other interested parties. They were concerned that the proposed development would have a significantly detrimental effect on the Castlefield Basin and Conservation Area, and that the disproportionate size and massing of the building would be overbearing to heritage assets that should be protected.

The applicant's representative spoke in support of the application responding to comments made about design and impact on the conservation area.

A Ward member spoke in support of residents' concerns and said that while they were not in disagreement that the site would benefit from redevelopment, the current proposals were not in keeping with the existing composition of buildings and other heritage assets, and that it was imperative that these be protected from inappropriate development. The member also questioned why the proposals put to the Committee in January said that a S106 agreement for a financial contribution to the provision of affordable housing had been deemed unsustainable, but that 1 month later it was now deemed to be possible.

A Committee Member asked whether the building material was appropriate for the conservation area, and also queried the addition of the S106 agreement as now viable. Officers confirmed that a residential development incorporating the proposed level of residential units and scale of buildings would be an acceptable response to national and local planning policy, and would promote a quality neighbourhood. The

report explained that this is an appropriate site for buildings of the scale and design proposed, and that the development proposed would be well designed and of a high quality, at this important gateway site, whilst responding to the conservation area within which it would sit; in addition it would fulfil an important role in providing residential accommodation within the City Centre, for which there is a need.

It was confirmed that the ability of a scheme to make a financial contribution to the provision of affordable housing through a S106 Agreement was constantly reassessed throughout the planning process. Officers also clarified that the recommendation to be 'minded to approve' subject to a legal agreement was set out in the printed appendix to the January meeting, however, as the item had been deferred there was no discussion on the matter at that time.

Decision

MINDED TO APPROVE subject to a S106 agreement for a financial contribution towards affordable housing and subject to the condition and for the reasons set out in the report and late representation.

PH/17/17 114146/FO/2016 - Surface Level Car Park Site Bounded By Tib Street, Church Street, Joiner Street And Bridgewater Place Manchester.

A planning application 114146/FO/2016 for the redevelopment of the site for a residential building (Class C3) with ground floor commercial uses (Class A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, D2 (Gym and Cinema) varying in height from 7 to 10 storeys to provide 183 apartments (8 x studio, 48 x 1 bed, 125 x 2 bed and 2 x 3 bed) with associated landscaping and other works following demolition of existing structure and artwork at junction of Tib Street and Church Street was received.

The application site comprises 0.28 hectares and is bounded by Tib Street, Church Street, Joiner Street and Bridgewater Place located within the Smithfield Conservation Area and the Northern Quarter. It is directly to the rear of the grade II listed Rylands (Debenhams) Building and is used as a 93 space surface level car park.

Historically, the site was entirely occupied by a number of buildings, including the Rylands & Co. Warehouse, which were demolished in the early 1990's. The site is cleared, except for a retained building remnant and retaining wall at the junction of Tib Street and Church Street which supports a piece of artwork designed by David Kemp. This corner wall was retained when the original buildings were demolished in to provide a context for the redevelopment of the site. There are currently 11 no. trees around the perimeter of the site

The site is at a transition between the Commercial Core and the Northern Quarter, the latter of which contains independent retail and leisure outlets and is noted for its cultural offer.

Officers confirmed that 2 further objections had been received and were detailed in the late representations. However, the issues raised were already addressed in the initial report.

The applicant's agent spoke in support of the proposals and said that the proposal would deliver a high quality building and regenerate a previously developed vacant site. The design is appropriately based on an evaluation of the particular characteristics of the site's context and would respond well to this. The site is considered to be capable of accommodating a building of the scale and massing proposed whilst avoiding any substantial harm to the character of the Smithfield Conservation Area or the setting of adjacent listed buildings. The street-frontages particularly along Church Street, Tib Street and Joiner Street would be re-vitalised and retain street-edge enclosure, while also complementing the vertical rhythms, established scale and visual texture of the individual streets.

The Committee noted that the recommendation was Minded to Approve subject to a S106 agreement for a financial contribution towards affordable housing; a Member asked in real monetary terms what this meant. Officers confirmed that such agreements were negotiated on a case by case basis and at this time whilst these discussions were on going the amount was not yet in the public domain.

The Committee noted that the Tib Street Horn would be donated to the City of Manchester, and asked for clarification of the cost that such a donation would entail to the City Council. Officers confirmed that this was still under negotiation and that conditions were included that would minimise costs to the Council.

Decision

MINDED TO APPROVE subject to a S106 agreement for a financial contribution towards affordable housing and subject to the conditions and for the reasons set out in the report and the late representation...

PH/17/18 113515/FO/2016 - 406 Barlow Moor Road Manchester M21 8AD.

A planning application 113515/FO/2016 for the change of use from hairdresser (Class A1) to hot food take-away (Class A5) involving the installation of extraction flue to rear of premises was received.

The application site is a mid-terraced shop unit of 2-storey's with front and rear dormers in a parade of 18 on the eastern side of Barlow Moor Road in the Chorlton Park ward. The parade is one of several close to the heart of the Chorlton District Centre and currently operates as a barber shop. Within this parade, some of which occupy two units, there are 7 x A1 uses, 6 x A2, 3 x A3, 1 x A4, 1 x A5 and 1 x vacant units with the range of uses covering estate agents, cafe bar / restaurants, an opticians, a tanning studio, hairdressers and non-food retail.

In front of the site is a dedicated parking lay-by offering short-stay parking whilst surrounding residential streets offer unrestricted on-street parking. At the rear of the site is an alley way where bins are stored. The first floor is in separate lease and has the potential for a residential use although it is unknown whether it is occupied at present. An assessment of the first floors of several other units suggests they are in residential use.

An interested party spoke to the Committee and said that despite the Officers assessment that there was only 1 other A5 premises in this parade, A5 uses in Chorlton District Centre as a whole currently exceed 5% of all businesses in the District Centre. This is contrary to policy 1 of the Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPD) for Hot Food Take Away's. The actual figure within the latest (2015) retail survey equates to 8.2%. To put this in context, within the 2015 survey, 279 shop units within Chorlton District Centre were trading, of which 23 were A5 uses. On a site specific level, within the parade of 18 where the application site is located, only 1 other unit trades as an A5 use.

Officers confirmed that the proposal would be sited in a parade of 18no shop units where the overarching land uses fall within the A1 (7no) and A2 (6no) Use Classes. The immediate area is relatively mixed with retail, estate agents and hairdressers making up the majority of the commercial offer. As stated above, within the parade where development is proposed, 1 other A5 use is in operation which is not adjacent to the application site, whilst another shop unit nearby is vacant.

Although the number of A5 uses is currently slightly above the 5% threshold contained within the draft SPD, this can only be given limited weight until the SPD is adopted. When assessed against policies C10 and DC10.1 of the development plan, it is not considered that the proposal would cause demonstrable harm. .

Furthermore, the proposed business would offer cold food, including sandwiches, in addition to hot food and proposes to open from 7am thus capturing the early morning commuter market. This would have the added benefit of a business that would not be closed with shutters down during the day which can otherwise give rise to negative perceptions within commercial centres that are harmful to attracting and retaining vital investment as well as benefitting the overall impression of the centre to visitors. Notwithstanding this and to ensure a positive perception is maintained, a condition requiring roller shutters to remain open during the day time is appended at the end of this report.

Decision

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

PH/17/19 114608/FH/2016 - 66 Dene Road Manchester M20 2SU.

A planning application 114608/FH/2016 for the erection of part single and part two storey extensions to the front and rear of the property following demolition of existing extension and erection of a porch to the front entrance was received.

The application site relates to a traditional, two-storey, semi-detached dwelling house situated on the northern side of Dene Road. The bay fronted property incorporates a hipped roof and enclosed front porch area and includes modest front and rear garden areas with a driveway serving a detached garage building to the side of the property.

A local resident spoke in objection to the proposals and said that the development would have a significantly detrimental impact on their residential amenity for the following reasons.

- The proposal would have a detrimental impact in terms of loss of light
- Due to the proximity, the height would reduce daylight into the living room window
- The window is the only source of natural light for the living room
- The rear of the properties face north east currently receiving direct sunlight, the single storey extension would reduce the light
- The two storey extension would prevent direct sunlight from reaching both upper and lower rear windows
- Manchester City Wide Policies state that extensions should not create an undue loss of light and sunlight, the development breaches this guidance
- The proposal would overshadow number 68 Dene Road due to the close proximity of the extension to the boundary
- The proposal would be positioned too close to the neighbouring boundary Road which would result in an uncomfortable sense of enclosure
- The development should provide more space between the boundary and the extension

A local elected member spoke in support of the resident and said that they shared their concerns that the development would be overbearing in the context of the neighbourhood.

Officers confirmed that the current proposal represents a revised scheme to that originally submitted. Due to concerns about the proximity of the single storey element and the overbearing impact of the two storey rear element to the other half of the semi-detached property, plans have been received which reduce the projection of both the ground and first floor rear projection from 3.9 metres to 3.6 metres. The retention of a gap of approximately 2.0 metres to the common boundary with the adjoining semi-detached property would be in place.

Decision

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