

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 14 December 2017

Present: Councillor Nasrin Ali (Chair).

Councillors: Barrett, Chohan, Curley, Lovecy, Madeleine Monaghan and Watson.

Apologies: Councillors: Shaukat Ali, Ellison, Fender, Kamal and Paul

Also present: Councillors: Ahmed Ali, Davies, Karney, Knowles, and Manco.

PH/17/120 Minutes

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 16 November 2017 as a correct record with the correction to item PH/17/114 that representation had been received from the MP for Manchester Gorton not the MP for Manchester Central.

PH/17/121 117078/FO/2017 - Grounds Of Langdale Hall, Upper Park Road, Manchester, M14 5RJ

A planning application 117078/FO/2017 for the erection of 6no. three storey six bedroom townhouses to provide managed student accommodation (sui generis use class) with landscaping and cycle parking was received.

This matter was previously received by the Committee on 16 November 2017, after a site visit took place that morning. Members resolved that they were minded to refuse the application and requested that officers prepare a further report that addressed the concerns that they raised and provided for further consideration of potential reasons for refusal.

A local resident spoke to the Committee and said that all of the concerns that had previously been raised remained, and that the further information provided had not alleviated any of the issues that they had with the proposed development.

A local Councillor also spoke to the Committee in support of the residents, and said that the proposals were inappropriate for the conservation area, and that the design and style of the proposed development is out of sync with the historic character of Victoria Park. He acknowledged that Manchester was a growing city in need of further accommodation, but that this proposal was for student accommodation which was already more than adequately supplied.

He further told the Committee that there are opportunities within the Victoria Park Conservation Area for the applicant to contribute to the re-use of Listed Buildings and other buildings with a particular heritage value. However, the applicant has chosen to do the complete opposite, to build on mature gardens, to the detriment of a listed building and its setting. He told the Committee that Councillors and residents were not opposed to all development, but that this scheme would not enhance the conservation area but would in effect cause significant harm.

The Applicants agent spoke to the Committee and said that Manchester Conservation Areas and Historic Buildings Panel had concluded that the proposals were modest and of a small scale and well sited. They felt it appeared to be a high quality piece of architecture that is respectful of the listed building. He said that the growth development of the city meant that it is essential that higher density development takes place, and that this was happening successfully across the city in several conservation areas, giving the example of the successful development of the former MMU campus in Didsbury.

He pointed out the previous scheme that had been refused in 2006 was a completely different scheme in terms of scale and concept. The Inspectors conclusions from the previous appeal decision would not apply to the current proposals. He also pointed out that the key features of the garden and the planted areas would be fully incorporated into the development, and that the siting of the development would retain the sense of openness that had been compromised by the proposals in the previous application. In addition, the proposals received an endorsement from Manchester University.

Officers confirmed that the applicant had submitted a comprehensive visual impact assessment of the effect on the conservation area, and that when assessed against national guidance the conclusion of officers was that the development would result in less than substantial harm to the conservation area, and that again when assessed against national guidance the benefits of the scheme outweighed any negative impact.

The Committee determined that the concerns that they raised as a result of the previous site visit, when they had been able to inspect the site and visualise what was planned had not been alleviated by the further information contained in the current report. The Committee also determined that while some of the concerns had been addressed, they found that the construction of a row of modern terrace properties in the garden of a listed building would be harmful to the conservation area and the setting of the listed building.

Decision

To refuse to grant the application as they concluded that the proposed development, due to its siting would be harmful to the spacious character and landscaped setting of the site and as a result would have a detrimental impact upon the character of the Victoria Park Conservation Area and the setting of Langdale Hall, contrary to Policies DM1 and EN3 in the Core Strategy and saved UDP Policies DC18 and DC19.

(Councillor Lovecy declared an interest in this matter and withdrew from the meeting while the matter was discussed and the decision was made)

PH/17/122 117402/FO/2017 - Denison House 71 Denison Road Manchester M14 5RX

A planning application 117402/FO/2017 for the erection of a single storey extension to the existing garage block and conversion to ancillary consular offices was received.

This is a part retrospective application in that works have commenced on site. Permission is sought to erect a single storey extension to the existing garage and to use the enlarged building as additional offices principally for the processing of visas.

The Committee determined that the proposed development subject to the appropriate conditions would make a positive contribution to the Victoria Park Conservation Area whilst not causing significant harm to the amenity of residents.

Decision

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

PH/17/123 116089/FO/2017 - Land Bound By Back Turner Street, Soap Street, Shudehill & High Street Manchester M4 1EZ

A planning application 116089/FO/2017 for the construction of a 122 bedroom apartment hotel (Class C1) comprising a part 4, part 5, part 8 and part 13 storey building with basement, public realm and landscaping works and demolition of existing buildings was received.

The application was previously received by the Committee at the meeting on 16 November 2017, when the decision was made to defer the matter to allow a site visit to take place. The site visit took place in the morning before the Committee convened.

A resident spoke to the Committee to object to the proposals, and said that the proposed development would have a significant detrimental impact on residents in terms of loss of light, anti-social behaviour from short term transient hotel residents, increased waste and rubbish and would be overbearing to adjacent buildings.

Residents were not opposed to the site being redeveloped, but were of the opinion that the proposals were not appropriate to the site and the historical context of the Smithfield Conservation Area. The local resident said that the majority of buildings in the immediate vicinity of this site were between 2 and 4 storeys, and that the development of a 13 storey high building would be overbearing and oppressive. He said that the design was no more than average with little architectural merit, and would appear dated within 5 years of construction.

The local resident further explained that in his opinion the scale of the proposals was as a result of the developer wishing to maximise the profitability of the site, with little regard for the amenity of people who already lived and worked in the area.

He added that the proposals acknowledged that the development would have a substantial impact on all residents of the adjacent Jewel House in terms of loss of light and overlooking. He said that the applicant had stated that this was a reinstatement of a previously demolished building, but that this justification was not valid as it failed to take into account the changes that had taken place in the area in the intervening 30 years since the previous building was demolished.

The resident also said that the scale of the development would attract significantly increased parking, and that as parking was already a problem, this would further exacerbate the issue for existing residents. He added that the current infrastructure was already inadequate with regard to both deliveries to existing businesses and collection of waste, and that the proposed waste management arrangements were completely inadequate.

A local Councillor spoke to the Committee in support of the residents objections, and said that she completely agreed with all of the concerns and issues that residents had raised. Councillors would welcome vibrant and appropriate development of this site, but said that they were opposed to the aspects of the development that would result in the loss of light to Jewell House residents, the inadequacy of the waste disposal arrangements and the height of the building at the Shudehill elevation, which is out of line with the run of other adjacent buildings on Shudehill. She suggested that smaller buildings can be successfully regenerated without the need for excessive height.

The applicant's agent spoke to the Committee and said that they acknowledge the concerns of the residents, and said that those who have lived in the area for some length of time are not unreasonable to feel a personal link to the site and the area in which they live. The applicant does want to be a good neighbour, but said that city centre development is important. He said that negotiations had already resulted in a decrease in height of the proposed development of a full floor and an additional 5 metres at the highest, Shudehill, elevation by reducing the height of the ceilings by 150mm per remaining floor. He said that there has been a full and comprehensive consultation, and of the 126 apartments in Jewel House, only 6 have objected.

He added that he and his team have a great deal of personal investment in the Northern Quarter in that they are based there and several members of the team also live there. He told the Committee that the proposals were a sympathetic scheme that was a good example of excellent urban design. He said that the design responds to the different characteristics of the 2 main elevations of the site and is appropriate for the setting of the conservation area.

Officers confirmed that in particular, the Shudehill elevation was part of an important gateway into the city centre with thousands of people passing through each day, and that the first thing that many see is this derelict and undeveloped site. The design would rejuvenate the derelict site and the proposal would provide a well-designed, high quality new building, which would respond to the existing and historic context. Officers also confirmed that the building would not be particularly high in the context of the city centre location of the site. Officers also informed that there are relatively large buildings in the vicinity of the site, including the Printworks, the Arndale Centre, the Shudehill transport hub and the Crowne Plaza Hotel. The design of the current proposals has also been subject to an independent peer review by a past president of RIBA, which concluded that the scheme is of good design and is worthy of the site.

Officers added that the proposal is in accordance with the City of Manchester's planning policies and regeneration priorities. It is also in accordance with the national planning policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and recommended that the application be approved.

The Committee expressed concern about the height of the building onto Shudehill; whilst not unusual in the city centre the question was the height in this particular location. In addition, as a result of the site visit members queried the current waste management arrangements for current occupiers of the buildings in the vicinity of the site and whether the proposal's strategy would be adequate. The Committee determined that the matter should be deferred for further discussion and negotiation between officers and the applicant.

Decision

To defer the matter to allow for:-

1. Further negotiation regarding the potential to reduce the height of the development on the Shudehill elevation.
2. Further clarity regarding the Waste Management Strategy.

(Councillor Barrett declared a prejudicial interest in this matter and withdrew from the meeting while the matter was discussed and the decision was made)

PH/17/124 117595/FO/2017 - Talbot Mills 44 Ellesmere Street Manchester M15 4JY

A planning application 117595/FO/2017 for the conversion of the Talbot Mill complex to create 114 residential apartments (Use Class C3), including rooftop extensions to Mill 1 and 2, and rear extension to Mill 1; demolition of Buildings A, B and C; retrospective application for demolition of Building E; erection of a 9 storey building plus 1 basement level, to provide 88 residential apartments (Use Class C3); and creation of new landscaped courtyard, lighting and other associated works was received.

The applicant's agent spoke to the Committee in support of the proposals, and said that this was a missing piece in the regeneration of the Ellesmere Street area, and said that this was a residential development that would be consistent with a number of the GM Strategy's key growth priorities through the delivery of housing to meet the demands of a growing economy and population, in a well-connected location adjacent to a major employment centre. It would therefore help to promote sustained economic growth within the City.

The applicant said that the proposed building and the conversion scheme, including the demolition of the various out buildings, would enhance the character and appearance of the nearby Castlefield Conservation Area and it would not harm the settings or significance of the nearby listed buildings.

The development has sought to minimise potential for overlooking and loss of sunlight and daylight. The proposal would regenerate a site that currently has a negative impact on the area and would improve the public realm in the area.

There were no objectors present and the Committee carefully considered all of the representations reflected in the report. The Committee raised concern that the

scheme provided no parking provision for residents, particularly for disabled occupiers. A member also questioned the absence of affordable housing on site, although accepted a S106 agreement for a financial contribution towards affordable housing elsewhere would be secured.

The Committee determined that the application should be deferred to allow for further negotiations between officers and the applicant to explore whether provision for car parking for disabled occupiers could be provided.

Decision

To defer the application to allow for further negotiations regarding the provision of car parking spaces for disabled people.

PH/17/125 116881/FO/2017 - Unit 5 Bentinck Street Industrial Estate Bentinck Street Manchester M15 4LN

A planning application 116881/FO/2017 for the erection of a new 11 storey building to accommodate 79 no. residential apartments (Use Class C3) together with associated roof terrace, car parking, landscaping, boundary treatment and public realm, following demolition of existing building on the site was received.

The building would have a central corridor with apartments looking out onto both Chester Road and the re-established Church Street. 6 duplex apartments would have a direct entrance from Church Street. All other apartments would be accessed via the main reception area on the lower ground floor. On the Church Street frontage, the building would adjoin the development recently approved on the adjacent 'Unit 6' site. The western elevation would face the recently approved development on the former Units 3 and 4. The elevation on this side would consist mostly of brick and would be largely windowless due to the close proximity between the proposal and the approved building adjacent. The separation distance would be approximately 6m.

Neither the applicant nor any objectors was present, and the Committee carefully considered all of the representations and information contained in the report. The Committee considered that the tall building and the residential accommodation would be an appropriate response to national and local planning policy. It would promote a quality neighbourhood, economic development and sustainable travel patterns. The proposed building would be well designed and of an appropriate quality and would provide much needed residential accommodation close to the City Centre. The proposal would regenerate a site that currently has a negative impact on the area and would improve the public realm in the area.

In addition the Committee determined that the proposal would enhance the character and appearance of the nearby Castlefield Conservation Area and although it would have an impact on the views of listed buildings on Chester Road, it would not harm their significance.

Decision

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

PH/17/126 117282/FO/2017 - Land Bounded By Tram Street, Parkhouse Street, Greenside Street and South Street Manchester

A planning application 117282/FO/2017 for the erection of 12 dwellinghouses (2-storey, two and three bedroom) and 15 x bungalows (one and two bedroom) with car parking, landscaping and boundary treatment and ancillary outbuildings within a communal garden was received.

This planning application relates to an area of grassed open space with extensive tree cover. It is bounded by Tram Street, Parkside Street, Greenside Street and South Street and lies in close proximity to Ashton Old Road. The area to the west of the application site is predominantly residential comprising of 2-storey red brick terraced housing. Industrial uses, including a car repair garage, are located to the east. Openshaw Park is located to the north of the site along with the Greggs Bakers factory. Other commercial and industrial uses are located to the south of the application site.

The applicant was present but did not speak. No objectors were present. The Committee carefully considered all of the representations and information contained in the report. The Committee welcomed the shared ownership aspect of the proposals, and said that such schemes were a valuable commodity for Manchester residents.

Decision

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

PH/17/127 Confirmation of The Manchester City Council (Land at 19 Palatine Crescent, Didsbury) Tree Preservation Order 2017

An objection to tree preservation order JK 21/06/17 TPO 19 Palatine Crescent Didsbury, Manchester M20 3LL was received.

On the 21st June 2017 a concerned local resident reported that works had just commenced to fell a mature oak tree within the rear garden of the 19 Palatine Road Crescent, Manchester and asked for a TPO to be made on the tree. The City Arborist visited the site later the same morning and following his advice an emergency TPO was made on the tree. While on site the City Arborist requested that the contractors ceased works as an emergency TPO was being made on the tree and this request was complied with and works stopped.

A local resident spoke in support of the TPO saying the tree is a beautiful, vigorous healthy specimen which probably predates or is complementary with the house. It forms a key part of the local landscape - there are 2 other similarly aged oak trees

nearby and together they are part of the historic and present character of Didsbury and Withington. In addition he said that the tree is highly visible and valued by a large number of nearby households. It forms part of the local urban forest, visible over numerous rooftops, and provides screening benefits for a number of households and its removal would have a significant negative impact on the surrounding area and the enjoyment of local people

This oak tree is important to creating a 'sense of place', its removal would detract greatly from the local landscape and character of the area. The oak tree's significant stature and presence cannot be replaced during this lifetime, and that the tree will continue to provide amenity well into the future due to the longevity of oaks and the vigorous health of this specimen. The tree provides huge benefits in terms of supporting local bio diversity, helping to improve air quality in this part of Manchester which suffers from high levels of pollution from vehicular traffic in particular from Wilmslow Rd

The Committee carefully considered all of the representations contained in the report and the verbal submissions made in person. The Committee determined that the Order has been properly made in the interests of securing the contribution this tree makes to the public amenity value in the area. The concerns of the homeowner have been fully considered and balanced against the contribution this oak tree makes to the local environment. Whilst it is acknowledged that the reason for objecting to the TPO, in particular concerns about bird and animal droppings and its size requires due consideration, it is not felt that they outweigh the significant contribution this tree of high amenity value makes to the area.

Decision

To instruct the City Solicitor to confirm the Tree Preservation Order at 19 Palatine Crescent, Didsbury, Manchester M20 3LL, under Section 199 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and that the Order should cover the trees as plotted on the plan attached to the report.