

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2017

Present: Councillor Ellison (Chair).

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

Apologies: Councillor Lovecy.

Also present: Councillors: Austin-Behan and Karney.

PH/17/82 Minutes

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 24 August 2017 as a correct record.

PH/17/83 117182/FO/2017 - Unit 6 Monsall Mill Monsall Road Manchester M40 8NQ.

A planning application 117182/FO/2017 for the use of premises as a place of worship (Use Class D1) was received. Retrospective planning permission was refused for the change of use of the application premises to a place of worship (Use Class D1) (107779/FO/2015/N1) on the 10 March 2015 by the Planning and Highways Committee for the following reason:

The creation of a place of worship at Unit 6 Monsall Mill (Use Class D1) creates harmful levels of noise, disturbance and comings and goings from the general activities associated with the use, such as vehicle movements, raised voices and on street parking congestion. This has a detrimental impact on surrounding residential amenity particularly residents along Monsall Road. This is contrary to the provisions of policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC26 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).

An appeal (APP/B4215/W/15/3010077) was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on the 27 August 2015 and temporary planning permission was granted for 12 months for the use of the premises with the inspector stating that such a permission 'would allow the use to be monitored with regard to its impact'.

During the temporary period the applicant sought to discharge planning conditions attached to the appeal decision. However, the information submitted for consideration was not considered to be acceptable. The applicant sought to appeal against the failure of the City Council to discharge the conditions. This appeal was unsuccessful and an award of costs was made for the applicant unreasonable behaviour in pursuing this appeal. The planning conditions associated with this appeal decision were never discharged and the temporary planning permission expired at the end of August 2016.

Prior to the expiration of the temporary appeal decision, the applicant sought to vary condition 1 (temporary period) of appeal decision referenced APP/B4215/W/15/301007 7 to allow extension of the use of the premises as a place of worship until 27 August 2017 (ref. 113347/JO/2016). This application was refused by the planning and highways committee on the 17 November 2016 for the following reason:

The continued use of the application site as a place of worship (Use Class D1) will by reason of increased noise levels emanating from both within the premises and external to them and disturbance from the general activities associated with the use namely, vehicle movements, car doors slamming and raised voices have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the residential amenity of local residents, particularly the residents of Monsall Road contrary to the provisions of policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC26 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).

Following the refusal of this application, the applicant sought to appeal the decision and on the 17 May 2017 the Planning Inspectorate granted a further temporary until 27 August 2017 subject to a number of condition relating to hours of use, numbers of people present at the premises at any one time and noise requirements (APP/B4215/W/16/3165982).

It should be noted that whilst the applicant has sought to discharge the noise requirements condition of this temporary approval the request was refused on the 4 August 2017 due to inadequate information (CDN/17/0344). No further requests to discharge this condition have been made during the temporary period and there the mitigation measures required by the planning inspector for the duration of this temporary period have not been implemented by the applicant.

The applicant is now seeking a permanent planning permission to use the premises as a place of worship.

A local Councillor spoke to the Committee and said that the worshipers at the Church showed a blatant disregard for local residents, and significantly he said that some residents had informed him that they had moved away as a direct result of the activities of the Church and the congregation.

Officers concluded that the permanent use of the application site as a place of worship (Use Class D1) will by reason of increased noise levels emanating from both within the premises and external to them and disturbance from the general activities associated with the use namely, vehicle movements, car doors slamming and raised voices have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the residential amenity of local residents, particularly the residents of Monsall Road. No satisfactory acoustic information has been submitted and on that basis the use is considered to be contrary to the provisions of policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policy DC26 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).

Decision

To refuse to grant approval for the reasons contained in the report and the late representation.

(Councillors Monaghan and Paul were not present during this item and took no part in the decision)

PH/17/84 116810/FO/2017 - Land At New Elm Road and Water Street Manchester, Big Yellow Storage.

A planning application 116810/FO/2017 for the construction of a six storey self-storage warehouse (Use Class B8). Access, parking and public realm works was received. The application proposes the development of a six storey, self-storage warehouse (Use Class B8). The applicant considers that there is an opportunity to meet the growing demand for storage with a new facility in this part of Manchester.

The warehouse would have:

- a reception area and toilets, utility area, staff kitchen and office;
- an undercroft service yard with areas for loading and unloading;
- nine car parking spaces for Big Yellow customers and staff; and
- six covered cycle parking to encourage sustainable transport use.

The Committee carefully considered all of the representations in the report, and the modifications to conditions that had been proposed.

The Committee welcomed the proposals, and considered that the proposals would provide a high quality self-storage facility. It would create new employment opportunities, support the strategic objectives of Castlefield and contribute to Manchester city centre's on-going regeneration and economic growth.

Decision

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

(Councillors Monaghan and Paul were not present during this item and took no part in the decision)

PH/17/85 116118/FO/2017 - Lighthouse and Light Aparthotel 20 Church Street Manchester M4 1PN.

A planning application 116118/FO/2017 for the Part retrospective consent for change of use of 58 apartments on the 6th, 8th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th and 18th/19th floors of Pall Mall House from Class C3 residential flats to a dual use of either Class C3 residential flat or Class C1 apartment hotel flats was received.

The application relates to 58 apartments in a number of buildings at a site bounded by Church Street, Joiner Street, Birchin Place and Bridgewater Place. They occupy

12 floors of the 20 storey Lighthouse building that is also known as 3 Joiner Street, which adjoins a 9 storey building known as Pall Mall House (20 Church Street). These buildings form the development which was approved by the Planning and Highways Committee under application ref no 072298/FO/2004/C1 in 2005 which granted consent for the erection of the apartment tower after part demolition of an existing building and alterations/conversion for a mixed use development comprising retail (A1); food and drink (A3); and 155 residential units.

A local Councillor, who was unable to attend in person, submitted a late representation which was conveyed verbally by officers. She said that she supported the application in principle, but asked that a condition be added to ensure that residential and apart-hotel units were not co-located on the same floor of the building, and that the management team of the apart-hotel units communicate regularly and effectively with the permanent residents.

The Committee carefully considered all of the representations. The Committee were satisfied that the conditions could be appropriately managed in the long term, so decided to approve the application.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report, and with additional conditions regarding a management strategy, which must be kept in place in perpetuity, and a strategy for engagement between residents and the management of the apart-hotel units.

(Councillor Paul was not present during this item and took no part in the decision)

PH/17/86 115894/FO/2017 - Land At Richmond Street Manchester M1 3WB.

A planning application 115894/FO/2017 for the erection of 7x 3 bed townhouses with integral garages, 1 x 2bed maisonette flat within a 4 storey building and new bin store; together with associated works including provision of secure route through to Richmond Street for occupiers of properties on Bloom Street that back onto the site. Consideration of this application was deferred at the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on 24 August 2017 to enable a site visit to take place.

A local resident spoke in objection to the proposals, and said that the proposed development was inappropriate for the location, and residential units in this location would be a source of friction. They told the Committee that the road was not suitable for vehicle access, and that similar units in the vicinity were vacant as people simply did not want to live there. He conceded that there may be a need for townhouses in the City Centre, but that this location was unsuitable.

A Councillor also spoke in support of the objectors, and reiterated that the proposals were unsuitable, given the mixed use of businesses in the vicinity. Adjacent bars are open until 2.00 a.m. and at the weekends sometimes 5.00 a.m.; the takeaways also stay open until 5.00 a.m. or even 6.00 a.m. at the weekends and the queue for the taxi rank at 41 Bloom Street can be 100 yards long at 5.00 a.m. weekends. The

use of this site for any form of residential accommodation and in particular 'family' accommodation would result in complaints about local business which could adversely impact on those business if they have to alter their current operational basis as a result of those complaints.

The Applicants agent also spoke to the Committee and said that this was a development that would regenerate a previously developed site. The massing would relate well to the adjacent listed building and be in keeping with the character of the conservation area. This part of Richmond Street would be re-vitalised and become a much safer feeling and welcoming environment and the proposal would enhance the city's wider historic landscape. The scheme would add much needed activity and vitality to the area and would reintegrate the site into its urban context, reinforcing the character of the streetscape. The agent also explained their experience in completing similar projects on tricky sites successfully.

The Committee carefully considered all of the representations. The Committee concluded that the clear public and regeneration benefits, including heritage benefits, which would result from the development of this site would outweigh any adverse impacts, including its impact on heritage assets and on amenity. In addition, the Committee recommended that a condition be added to ensure that the garage space in the units could not be converted to living accommodation.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representation, and with an additional condition to prevent the conversion of the garage space to living accommodation.

(Councillor Paul was not present during this item and took no part in the decision)

PH/17/87 112391/JO/2016/S2 - Burnage Cricket and Social Club Mauldeth Road Burnage Manchester M19 1AB.

This item was deferred for further consideration by officers.

PH/17/88 114896/FO/2016 - Land At the Junction of Alness Road and Wellington Road Manchester M16 8FX.

A planning application 114896/FO/2016 for the erection of 18 no. three-storey townhouses (all four-bed), creation of a new vehicular and pedestrian access from Wellington Road, car parking, bin store, hard and soft landscaping following demolition of the existing building and removal of trees was received.

The proposal involves the demolition of 'Hollybank' and redevelopment of the site with 18 no. four bedroom three-storey townhouses, creation of a new vehicular access from Wellington Road, car parking, bin store, hard and soft landscaping following demolition of the existing building and removal of trees.

The scheme originally submitted was for the erection of 13 No. townhouses (all four bed) and a four storey block of 16no. apartments (12 two bed and 4 one bed), creation of a new vehicular and pedestrian access from Wellington Road, car parking, bin store, hard and soft landscaping following demolition of the existing building and removal of trees.

Concerns were expressed with regards to the inclusion of apartments within the first scheme, both in terms of the principal of apartments on site and with regards to the scale, massing and design of the apartment block in terms of its impact upon the character and visual amenity of the conservation area. Negotiations have taken place to remove the apartments to secure family housing in line with policy H6 of the Core Strategy which states that outside District Centres the priorities will be for housing which meets identified shortfalls, including family housing.

The applicant's agent spoke to the Committee and said that this was a high quality development that would provide family accommodation, which was much needed in the area. In addition, the development would allow for improvements and investment to be made in the adjacent St Bede's College.

The Committee carefully considered all the representations. The Committee considered that the proposals, whilst involving the demolition of a building in a conservation area do not cause harm to Whalley Range Conservation Area as a designated asset, nor do the proposals impact upon listed buildings close by. As a result they were satisfied to approve the application, subject to a request to explore the possibility of planting more trees. In addition the Committee requested that further consideration be given to car parking and access to the site.

Decision

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

(Councillor Watson declared an interest in this item and withdrew from the meeting during the discussion and took no part in the decision)

PH/17/89 116563/FH/2017 - 1 Walsingham Avenue Manchester M20 2XG.

A planning application 116563/FH/2017 for the relocation of gate posts was received. Walsingham Avenue is one of a number of short, residential cul-de-sacs off Burton Road within the Albert Park Conservation Area. This application relates to No. 1 Walsingham Avenue, a two-storey property at the end of a terrace of six. The properties have small front garden areas, bounded by low red brick walls with stone copings and distinctive stone gate posts painted white. The front area of the application property has been paved over. There are no off-street parking areas on the avenue and residents currently park diagonally over the footway.

Consent is sought for the relocation of the gate posts within the front boundary. Originally the proposal involve moving the gate posts to the far ends of the frontage, but has been amended so that they sit more in line with the front door of the house. The applicant also intends to take down the front wall in order to allow parking off-street. The removal of the wall does not require planning permission.

The Committee carefully considered all of the representations. They could not conclude that the relocation of the gate posts would result in an unacceptable impact on parking in the area to warrant refusal of the application.

Decision

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