

## Planning and Highways Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2018

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

**Councillors:** Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Barrett, Chohan, Curley, Fender, Kamal, Lovecy, Madeleine Monaghan, and Paul

**Apologies:** Councillor Watson

**Also present:** Councillors: Cookson, Davies, Karney, Leech, Manco, N. Murphy, Rahmen, Richards, Siddiqi, A Simcock, K. Simcock, Stone, Webb and Wilson.

#### **PH/18/1      Minutes**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 14 December 2017 as a correct record.

#### **PH/18/2      118127/FO/2017 - Open Land to the South of Ashton Old Road and North of Whitworth Street (Currently Bisected By Redby Street), Manchester M11 2NP**

Planning application 118127/FO/2017 was considered for the erection of two storey building (incorporating mezzanine) to form drive-through coffee shop (use class A1/A3) and commercial unit (A1/A3), together with associated parking, landscaping and new access.

In this case planning permission was being sought for the erection of a new two-storey building incorporating a mezzanine floor for the creation of a drive through coffee shop (Class A1/A3) and a separate commercial unit (Class A1/A3).

The building is of a contemporary design with the proposal entailing the creation of new car area which envelopes the building, a drive through lane, the stopping up of Redby Street and a landscaped perimeter.

The applicant's agent spoke to the Committee and said that this was a high quality development that would bring a brownfield site back into productive use. The current site offers no positive contribution to the Ashton Old Road corridor, and the proposals would include landscaping and the planting of native trees that would significantly improve the street scene. They acknowledged the comments made by the Manchester College, but said that the conditions proposed in the report would mitigate all the issues that had been raised, and told the Committee that the Manchester College had been properly notified at all stages of the application process.

In addition to the information in the report, at the meeting it was reported that further representations had been made by the Head of Planning and a copy of those written representations was provided to the Committee.

The Committee welcomed the proposals as they would improve the street scene and regenerate a current brownfield site that would provide both employment opportunities and environmental improvements.

### **Decision**

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the amendments to the conditions set out in the late representations from the Head of Planning.

### **PH/18/3      117846/VO/2017 - Nutsford Vale, Matthews Lane, Manchester**

The Committee considered a request for a site visit. The Committee decided that the members would benefit from viewing on the site the possible impact that the proposals would have on the setting of the site, traffic and the surrounding area.

### **Decision**

To defer consideration of the matter to allow a site visit to be carried out by the members of the Committee.

### **PH/18/4      117274/FO/2017 - Kingsway Hotel, Moseley Road, Manchester M19 2LJ**

Planning application 117274/FO/2017 was for the erection of an apartment block with a maximum height of 5 storeys (excluding roof top plant) and comprising 27 units (26 two-bedroom and one one-bedroom) with car parking, amenity space and boundary treatments and 4 two storey houses with roof space accommodation with garden areas, car parking and associated walls and fencing and vehicular access from Kingsway and Moseley Road following the demolition of an existing public house at the site.

The application was formerly the subject of the following planning application:

113387/FO/2016 - Erection of four-storey building to 41 2-bedroom apartments together with associated car parking and landscaping and alterations to existing highway access following demolition of existing building

That application had been withdrawn 15 August 2017 following discussions with officers who had expressed concerns regarding the magnitude of the proposed development and its impact in urban design terms.

Through this revised application (ref: 117274/FO/2017) and its subsequent amendments, the applicant had sought to respond to the previously expressed concerns as part of an on-going dialogue with officers. The proposed development has been significantly amended since its original submission in relation to both the number of proposed residential units, elevational design and arrangements for car parking and amenity space.

The applicant's agent spoke to the Committee and said that the application had been significantly amended during the application process as a result of the negotiation and discussions with officers. He explained that the proposals were part of a wider scheme where the Town Houses would be marketed for market sale, with the profits being gift aided back to Great Places Group for the provision of affordable housing. He also indicated that the application provides affordable rented accommodation and confirmed that the proposed apartments would be let with 6 to 12 month initial tenancies with options for longer terms as requested. On this basis, the development would secure a significant contribution to the continued provision of affordable housing in the local area. It is considered that the inclusion of an affordable provision in respect of the proposed 4 houses would be an onerous requirement given the proportion of this element of housing within the overall development. It is therefore not considered that the provision of affordable housing would be appropriate and the proposed development would meet the criteria for exceptionality and thereby comply with Core Strategy policies H1 and H8.

In addition to the information in the report, at the meeting it was reported that further comments had been received on behalf of the applicant, the Head of Planning, and a local Councillor who wished to withdraw her earlier objection. A copy of those written representations was provided to the Committee.

The Committee welcomed the scheme and the way in which it contributed positively to the provision of affordable housing in Manchester.

### **Decision**

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the amendments to the conditions as set out in the late representations made by the Head of Planning.

*(Councillor Barrett left before this item and Councillor Nasrin Ali declared an interest in this matter and left the meeting while the matter was discussed and the decision was made)*

### **PH/18/5      118057/FO/2017 - Land Bounded by Cable Street, Cross Keys Street, Addington Street And Mason Street, Manchester, M4 5FT**

A planning application 118057/FO/2017 for the erection of a 9 storey building to form a 224-bed apart-hotel (use class C1) with associated public realm, landscaping and other associated works was received. The aparthotel was to be operated by the applicant 'Staycity'.

The applicant's agent spoke to the Committee and said that the applicant had already secured an operator for the site, and that work could start immediately, subject to the application being approved. He told the Committee that the site was currently a brownfield site, used as a surface car park, and that the proposals would make a positive contribution to both the street scene and the New Cross Regeneration Framework aspirations. He further said that careful consideration had been given to the siting, scale and appearance of the development to ensure it would

provide a high quality development along with minimising the impact on existing and future residents.

A contribution has been sought towards placing-making in the New Cross area in order to help provide off site public realm and other infrastructure works needed to connect New Cross to the wider area including the heart of the City Centre.

The Committee questioned officers as to why the S106 agreement would be for the provision of public realm improvements rather than for the provision of affordable housing, and officers confirmed that this was because the proposals were for a commercial premises rather than for residential accommodation. In addition, as the development is in the New Cross area of the city centre it is subject to a public realm strategy. This comprises an agreed street hierarchy/connectivity strategy with highway material specifications, wider public realm and infrastructure improvements and an on street parking strategy. Officers also confirmed that the applicant will be required to contribute to this alongside the need to progress highways works through a s278 agreement.

### **Decision**

Minded to approve, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report and the signing of a section 106 agreement with regards to public realm and infrastructure improvements within the New Cross Area.

*(Councillor Kamal left during this item)*

### **PH/18/6      116089/FO/2017 - Land Bound by Back Turner Street, Soap Street, Shudehill and High Street, Manchester, M4 1EZ**

Consideration of this application had been deferred at the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on 16 November 2017 to enable a site visit to take place (Minute PH/17/113). The application had then been considered by the Planning and Highways Committee on 14 December 2017, following a site visit earlier in the day (Minute PH/17/123). The Committee had then resolved to defer the application to enable officers to have discussions with the applicant regarding a reduction in height of the Shudehill component of the scheme and to allow further negotiations regarding the waste management strategy.

The application now before the Committee was that which had been considered at the previous meeting. The applicant has subsequently confirmed that they consider this to be an appropriate scheme for the site which would deliver the floorspace required. They believe that its form follows good urban design principles and has sought to minimise the impact on local residents and, respond appropriately to the status of the Shudehill frontage as a major route into the City Centre and opposite a major transport interchange. They have, therefore, requested that the Committee determines the proposal as it stands.

In addition to the information in the report, at the meeting it was reported that further representations had been made by councillors and comments by the Head of Planning. A copy of those written representations was provided to the Committee.

There was also a further verbal late representation reported by officers from a Councillor who supported the local members and who raised a question about an appeal. This was responded to by officers who reminded the Committee that it had to discharge its responsibility as local planning authority only and dismiss any other interest and comments in relation to the City Council

A local resident spoke in objection to the proposals, and said that they were very disappointed with the recommendation which favours visitors over long term residents. They do not consider that the daylight report is sufficient stating that nobody visited Jewel House and the report refers to various living spaces but the authors have not been inside flats.

Their objection to the substation location has not been acknowledged and they consider that the quietest component of the scheme would face non-residential accommodation.

It was said that whilst the Shudehill side has been reduced, they had been told by the architect that the building would not be reduced. They consider that long term residents who helped to shape the area are completely ignored and thought that the planning consultation process was designed to work collaboratively, which is why they made their concerns known early so they could be taken into consideration. The resident also objected to the fact that the applicant had previously stated that the residents of the adjoining Jewel House had “had more than their fair share of daylight” and said that the right to light over a number of years could not be quantified in this way.

It was acknowledged by the objector that something would need to happen on site, but not at this scale. The site has so much potential but the design is overbearing and mediocre in their view.

The applicant’s agent spoke to the Committee and said that the site is located on a major gateway entry into the city centre and at a key nodal point. It is also within the Northern Quarter which has been, and continues to be, a focus for major public and private investment. The proposed use is acceptable in principle and is consistent the City Councils planning policy and regeneration objectives.

The site is partly-derelict and partly-vacant site and has a negative impact on a prominent gateway entry route and the Smithfield Conservation Area. The proposal would provide a well-designed, high quality new building, which would respond to the existing and historic context. It would provide substantial public realm improvements around the site.

The agent said that the proposal would have a beneficial impact on the character and appearance of the Smithfield Conservation Area by putting a current gap site back into active use, reinstating the historic building line of High Street. It is considered that the proposed scheme would not adversely affect the understanding or appreciation of the Grade II listed buildings near the site or other heritage assets in the surrounding area, resulting in an overall neutral effect. He also said that the proposal would have an impact on the amenity of some existing residents who

overlook the site, but these have to be considered in a city centre context where buildings tend to be situated in closer proximity to one another.

A local Councillor spoke to the Committee on behalf of all City Centre Councillors, and Councillors of the neighbouring ward. She said that Councillors were unanimous in objecting to the proposals, and completely supported the residents in their objections. She told the Committee that the Shudehill elevation of the proposals was far too high, given the limited height of the buildings along the same run, which included the listed Lower Turks Head public house. If allowed, this elevation would be overbearing on both the street scene and the surrounding buildings in the conservation area. She also pointed out that part of the proposed development site was under public ownership, and that this should have a bearing on the drive for maximum profitability of the development, as public ownership should take more account of the disamenity to residents rather than purely considering the profitability of the scheme. The local Councillor also pointed out that this was a significant gateway to the City, but that this did not necessarily mean that a tall building was appropriate, given the history of Shudehill with low rise workshops and living accommodation being the predominant building type.

A further concern was the speed with which the application had been brought back before the Committee, in an unchanged form. She pointed out that the Committee had previously asked for further negotiation regarding the height of the development, but that their apparent concerns had been ignored as the application had been resubmitted without any detail of the further negotiation or without any difference to the height of the development.

Officers responded to the concerns raised which reflects the comments in the body of the report. Members were also advised that discussions with the applicant had taken place speedily after the last Committee and that the applicant had asked that the matter be determined on the basis of the proposal before them.

The Committee expressed disappointment that the concerns that had previously been raised about the height of the proposed development at the Shudehill elevation had not led to amended proposals being brought forward by the applicant. They acknowledged that the site was in need of regeneration but questioned the appropriateness of the development that was proposed. Their opinion was that the development was too high on the Shudehill elevation and this would have a harmful effect on the setting of Shudehill.

The Committee asked that a report be brought back which addressed the concern raised and a potential reason for refusal based on the height of the development on Shudehill for further consideration.

## **Decision**

Minded to refuse the application due to the potential harm caused to the historic setting of Shudehill due to the height of the proposed development at that elevation.

*(Councillor Barrett declared a prejudicial interest in this item, and left the room while the matter was discussed and while the decision was made)*

**PH/18/7      117595/FO/2017 - Talbot Mills, 44 Ellesmere Street, Manchester  
M15 4JY**

Consideration of this application was deferred at the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on 14 December 2017 to allow further consideration to be given to the provision of parking for disabled people as part of the scheme (Minute PH/17/124). The applicant had reviewed whether it would be possible to provide parking spaces within the court yard and had concluded that this was not possible, largely because of the change in level between the street and the courtyard.

It is proposed to provide two parking spaces on Ellesmere Street outside the development. In addition to this, the applicant has confirmed that the Travel Plan would provide full details of further access and liveability initiatives for disabled people, such as registering to 'Disabled-Go' which provides information online for how to travel to specific locations.

In addition to the information in the report, at the meeting it was reported that further representation had been made by a local resident and by the Head of Planning. A copy of those written representations was provided to the Committee.

The applicant's agent spoke to the Committee and said that this was a specialised, sensitive restoration of a heritage asset in Manchester. He also said that a residential development incorporating a new building and the conversion of non-designated heritage assets, along with the proposed level of residential units would be an appropriate response to national and local planning policy. It would promote a quality neighbourhood, economic development and sustainable travel patterns. The site is appropriate for the proposed building and the development would be well designed and of a high quality and would fulfil an important role in providing residential accommodation within Manchester, for which there is a need.

Residential development 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

He told the Committee that officers had confirmed 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 agent also pointed out that the applicant had fully participated in the setting up of a residents' consultation forum, and while he acknowledged that some developers may have breached the terms of their individual Construction Management conditions to the detriment of residential amenity, this developer would fully comply with all Construction Management conditions to minimise disruption to existing residents.

A councillor read out a statement on behalf of another two local ward councillors who were unable to be present at the meeting. In the statement the Councillor said that while they welcomed development that enhanced and preserved heritage assets, there was a concern that the level of development in the area as a whole was having

a detrimental impact on local residents. Further development should be very carefully planned, and that developers should consult fully with local residents and local Councillors to minimise the impact on those who already lived there. A particular concern is the increase in traffic movements, especially at the junction of Hulme Hall Road and Chester Road, and he requested that this issue be subject to strict controls as part of the traffic management plan.

In addition the statement said that while the author welcomed the provision of two disabled parking spaces, he was disappointed that no more than two spaces were proposed, and asked that this be addressed within the S106 agreement with local parking being included in any improvements to the public realm.

Officers confirmed that there were conditions within the proposed consent that would be imposed and monitored to ensure compliance and to mitigate any risk of disamenity to residents should the proposals be approved.

The Committee welcomed the provision of disabled parking spaces, and while they acknowledged that only 2 would be provided they were satisfied that this was the maximum possible provision given the constraints of the site. The Committee also welcomed the level of cycle parking at 122% based on the number of apartments.

The Committee did raise concerns at the cumulative development in the general area of this proposal and the impact of those on the level of residential parking available in the area. They hoped those would be addressed by the Council through other discussions and work.

## **Decision**

Minded to approve subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the report and the signing of a S106 agreement for a financial contribution towards affordable housing.

### **PH/18/8      117793/FO/2017 - 5-7 Abberton Road, Manchester, M20 1HQ**

A planning application 117793/FO/2017 for the Conversion of two six-bedroom houses in multiple occupation into seven self-contained apartments, including the erection of a two-storey rear extension and a two-storey side extension, formation of lightwells and associated works to car parking, landscaping and boundary treatment was received.

This application relates to a pair of two-storey, villa-style properties currently in use as two, six-bedroom HMOs. They are located in a primarily residential area with a mix of house types and sizes, and many of the larger properties have been converted to flats or HMOs, but there is significant family housing in the area too.

The proposal involves the conversion of the properties into seven apartments: six were to be two-bedroom and one was one-bedroom; physical works to extend at side and rear, including increasing the height of the existing two-storey outrigger and its extension; creation of lightwells and creation of seven parking spaces to the rear.



In addition to the information in the report, at the meeting it was reported that further representations had been made by the applicant's agent which responded to the comments made by the objectors to the proposal. A copy of those written representations was provided to the Committee.

The Committee considered that the properties are currently in HMO use, providing six bedrooms in each property. The proposal is to change the use and refurbish the properties to for a total of seven self-contained flats. The refurbishment of the properties is welcomed and it is considered that properties of this size are unlikely to be used as a single dwellings again, therefore flats would seem the most appropriate use. The proposed development represents an improvement in the standard of accommodation with a change from HMOs to self-contained apartments.

### **Decision**

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

#### **PH/18/9      117226/FH/2017 - 30 Longton Avenue, Manchester, M20 3JN**

A planning application 117226/FH/2017 for the erection of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation was received.

In this case, planning permission is sought for the erection of a two storey side and single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation.

Initially, the proposal required the removal of trees along the shared boundary on land to the side of the application site, however the submission of a recent Method Statement received on the 12<sup>th</sup> December 2017 outlined that the works could be carried out without the need to remove any trees. This has been confirmed by the City Council's arborist.

In addition to the information in the report, at the meeting it was reported that further representations had been made by a residents' association and by the City Council's arborist. A copy of those written representations was provided to the Committee.

The Committee carefully considered all of the representations and agreed that the conditions in the report would mitigate any risk to both the existing trees and the other concerns raised.

### **Decision**

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and an amendment to a condition regarding works to trees as verbally reported in the meeting.

#### **PH/18/10      117847/FO/2017 - Existing Car Park off Cotton Lane, Christie Hospital Manchester, M20 4UX**

Planning application 117847/FO/2017 was considered for the erection of a 7.7 metres to 10.6 metres high tiered car park providing 8 levels of decked parking (semi-basement, ground floor level, levels 1 to 6) and reconfiguration of the surface-level car park with landscaping and associated infrastructure (including access roads, drainage, parking, fences and external lighting), following demolition of two accommodation buildings.

The Committee considered a request for a site visit but decided that the report provided them with adequate information to determine the matter without needing a site visit.

The application is made up of the following elements which have been designed in the context of The Christie Strategic Planning Framework that was endorsed by the Executive in June 2014. It would complement The Christie's Green Travel Plan (GTP) which aims to mitigate the impact of their operation upon surrounding neighbourhoods. The applicants are proposing the following:

- Erection of a multi-tiered car park to provide 565 spaces and reconfiguration of the surface level car park to provide 253 spaces. 818 spaces are proposed in total and this equates to a net increase of 404 spaces.
- The total number of spaces provided will include 34 disabled parking spaces and 12 electric car parking spaces.
- The multi-tiered car park will provide car parking on 8 levels (semi-basement and ground floor levels and then levels 1 to 6). The uppermost parking level is approximately 10.2 metres in height at parapet level and the three lift shafts located on the northern, western and southern facades are 12.23 metres, 12.17 metres and 11.9 metres in height respectively.
- Junction improvements at the Cotton Lane/Wilmslow Road junction, including a reconfiguration of the existing road layout, upgrading the existing traffic lights and enhancing the cycle infrastructure through the introduction of advance cycle stop boxes.
- Introduction of a Pelican crossing at the Cotton Lane/Wilmslow Road junction to enhance connectivity with the main hospital campus.
- Junction improvements to the Cotton Lane/Heyscroft Road junction, including the building out of the kerbs on each side of Heyscroft Road.
- Provision of 26 cycle parking spaces.
- Associated landscaping scheme including the provision of 33 replacement trees

To facilitate the proposal, two of the three 3 storey buildings will be demolished and a total of 16 trees will be felled (1 x moderate quality tree, 9 x low quality trees and one low quality group consisting of six young trees). None of the protected trees are to be removed.

In addition to the information in the report, at the meeting it was reported that further representations had been made by the applicant's agent, ward councillors for the Old Moat Ward, and by the Head of Planning. A copy of those written representations was provided to the Committee. The support of Jeff Smith MP was also reported the meeting.

A local residents spoke in objection to the proposals, and said that the proposals were inappropriate for the conservation area, and that the size of the structure would be overbearing. He referred to a decision to refuse consent for a multi-storey car park on the same site made some years previously. He also said that the increased traffic that would be generated by the development would have a significantly detrimental impact both on the amenity of local residents due to noise and disruption, but would also have a significantly detrimental impact on air quality. The local resident said that there had been inadequate consultation, and that the existing Controlled Parking Zone should have been much more extensive from the beginning.

The applicant's agent addressed the meeting and explained how the Hospital Trust had sought to learn from and address the mistakes made with the previous application that had been rejected. He outlined the measures the Trust was taking to work with the local community and the Council. He said that despite these measures there was still insufficient on-site parking to meet the demand, and the existing controlled parking zone was displacing some of that demand into areas further from the hospital. The Trust remains of the view that more on-site parking is essential. He explained how the design of the building and landscaping sought to mitigate its impact on adjacent residents.

Three councillors also addressed the meeting. The first spoke as the Chair of the Christie Hospital Neighbourhood Forum and the Council's representative on the Trust's Council of Governors. He asked the Committee to support the application based on his extensive knowledge of the parking issues in and around the hospital. He also spoke on behalf of other councillors in the wards around the hospital explaining how many local councillors supported the proposal. He recounted the existing measures being taken by the hospital to help manage parking in the vicinity of the site and described the Strategic Planning Framework the Council has adopted for the site, and how well this proposal responded to that Framework. Another councillor referred to the evidence submitted on the negligible impact that the vehicle movements arising from the additional 404 parking places were likely to have on air quality in the local neighbourhood. He also emphasised the importance of the proposed S106 agreement to extend the Controlled Parking Zone so as to help alleviate the problems that residents just outside the existing Zone have with hospital parking displaced into the streets where they live. The third councillor explained that he was reluctantly supporting the application, with his reluctance based on the history of how the Trust had handled the issue of parking over the years. He referred to issues that he hoped would be addressed by how an extension to the Controlled Parking Zone was agreed with the Trust through the proposed S106 agreement. He also suggested the inclusion of a condition to ensure that no additional pollution would arise from the vehicle movements the extra parking spaces would generate.

Members of the committee felt it would be very important for local councillors to be involved in the design of the extension to the Controlled Parking Zone. Members also felt that the new car park should not come into operation until the extended Controlled Parking Zone was in place and sought some assurance that the Council would be able to agree and implement the extension to the Zone before the car park comes into use. The Head of Planning explained that it should be possible to include triggers and such requirements into the S106 agreement.

## Decision

1. To decline the request for a site visit.
2. To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and subject to the signing of a S106 Agreement in connection with the expansion of the Controlled Parking Zone, requesting that the drawing up of the Agreement address the issues that had been raised by the Committee and the matters raised by local councillors.

### **PH/18/11 117633/FH/2017 - 53 Kingston Road, Manchester, M20 2SB**

A planning application 117633/FH/2017 for the erection of a two storey rear extension and a single storey side extension to form additional living accommodation and installation of rooflights to the front and side was received.

Originally the ridge height of the rear extension matched the ridge height of the main house. However, following concerns about the bulk of the rear extension the applicant amended the proposal by reducing the height of this element of the proposal by approximately 0.5 metres and replacing the gable roof with a hipped roof. In addition, the applicant also reduced the rearward projection of the first floor element by approximately 0.7 metres.

To facilitate the proposal the existing single storey rear extension has been demolished and two apple trees are to be felled.

In addition to the information in the report, at the meeting it was reported that further representations had been made by ward councillors setting out their objections, and by the Head of Planning explaining what trees were to be felled. A copy of those written representations was provided to the Committee.

A local resident addressed the meeting to object to the application. He referred to the objections that were set out in the report before the Committee especially the excessive scale of the development and the likely harmful impact on neighbouring "Shirley Houses".

The applicant spoke at the committee and referred to the history of applications on the site in recent months, and why those had not been supported by planning officers. He felt this application now addressed the faults of those earlier applications and now reflected the importance of the "Shirley Houses" and the site's location in a Didsbury St. James Conservation Area. The majority of the proposed development will be at the rear of the property and so not visible from the highway. He also said this site was bigger than the size of the plots for the other "Shirley Houses", and so could better accommodate the extension.

The meetings was addressed by a local councillor who spoke on behalf of all three ward councillors. He asked the committee to reject the application. He said that the development would have a significant impact on the Conservation Area and on the neighbouring "Shirley Houses".

Having considered the officers recommendations and the representations made in the report and at the meeting the committee approved the application.

## **Decision**

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

### **PH/18/12 117851/VO/2017 - 836 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M20 2RR**

A planning application 117851/VO/2017 for the erection of a part two, part three storey school building with associated external works, car parking, landscaping, boundary treatments and creation of a vehicular access from Wilmslow Road was received.

The current application seeks permission for the erection of a part two, part three storey school building to be used as an extension to Beaver Road Primary School accommodating 2,380 sqm of internal floorspace. It also proposes associated external works, car parking and parent drop off spaces (27 car parking spaces including 2 no. accessible spaces), cycle parking (28 covered spaces), landscaping, boundary treatments and creation of a vehicular access from Wilmslow Road. The school building is proposed to be set back from the road frontage with car parking and parent drop off facility towards the front accessed from the new access to Wilmslow Road.

The position of the vehicular access into the site reflects that previously approved under planning approval 108541/OO/2015/S2. In addition part of the lower level of the western portion of the site is to be utilised for outdoor play space for the school which will be accessed by ramp and steps and securely fenced to tie in with the existing 2.4 metre high weld mesh fencing that bounds the site. This lower level of open space was associated with the former Broomhurst Halls of Residence, information previously provided to the Council (under planning application 108541) for these Playing Fields confirmed that the land was informal outdoor space for the Halls of Residence and were not in formal or active sporting or recreational use.

The proposed school expansion site is approximately 500 metres to the south and west from the existing school site on Beaver Road.

The applicant indicates that the new school building would enable Beaver Road Primary School to expand to a 5 form entry school (1050 pupils and increase from its current pupil population of 716 pupils including nursery) with school years 1, 2 and 3 remaining on the existing site and the older pupils in years 4, 5, 6 occupying the proposed school building, providing accommodation for 450 pupils.

In addition to the information in the report, at the meeting it was reported that further representations had been made by local residents, the applicant, the Manchester Conservation Areas and Historic Buildings Panel, Environmental Health and the Head of Planning. A copy of those written representations was provided to the Committee.

The Committee was addressed by a representative of Didsbury Civic Society who set out the Society's objections to the application, especially the proposed travel plan that is related to the application. He felt that the data that had been collected to develop that travel plan was invalid; that the proposal in that plan were impractical; and that the applicant could do more to promote a drop-off zone for the proposed school.

A representative of the applicant spoke at the meeting. He explained that the school was trying to respond to the needs of the local community by expanding its intake in a part of the city with very high demand and pressure for infant and primary school places.

The meeting was addressed by local Councillors. The first expressed regret that the expansion was on the proposed site, and not on the other side of the road and so away from the main road. He felt that the report before the Committee contained a number of errors or false assumptions. He expressed fears for parents stopping and dropping children off on Wilmslow Road and other concerns about the travel plan for the proposed school and availability of staff parking. He also felt that there should be a condition to mitigate any pollution from the development and suggested changes to other conditions. The second Councillor represented the views of three ward councillors in the adjacent ward. He said that the councillors all supported the application. He said that the councillors felt that problems with parking and travel could be overcome. He spoke of the urgent need for the expansion of school places in this area.

Members of the Committee discussed the travel plan and road safety issues that had been raised by consultees and the adequacy of the drop-off facility. The officers explained how proposed conditions as set out in the report had been specifically included to address those concerns.

## **Decision**

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the amendment to the conditions set out in the late representations made by the Head of Planning.

### **PH/18/13 Confirmation of The Manchester City Council - Tree Preservation Order 2017 (Jackson Court, 249 Ryebank Road, Chorlton)**

An objection to a tree preservation order JK 7/08/17 at 249 Ryebank Road, Chorlton, Manchester M21 9LX was received.

On the 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017 a concerned local resident reported that works were to commence to fell a mature Silver Birch tree within the rear garden of 249 Ryebank Road, Manchester and asked for a TPO to be made on the tree. Cllr Sheila Newman and the City Arborist visited the site later the same morning and on the advice of the City Arborist, an emergency TPO was made on the tree.

An objection has been received from the regional landscape manager of the landowner/ management company.

In summary it states:

- No evidence has been provided or referenced to justify this provisional TPO has undergone an objective amenity assessment
- Tree is situated in the rear of a small confined communal garden area and only top part of canopy is visible from the street. Government guidance states that in cases where a tree is barely visible from a public place there must be exceptional circumstances to support the making of a TPO. In this case they do not exist
- This tree has particularly poor form with a very wide low fork that has led to incongruous form that detracts from the visual amenity of the area.
- The tree is overly mature and now showing early stages of decline. As it is situated in a small garden its natural shedding of limbs is likely to cause damage to the property and is a significant concern to residents of Jackson Court.
- This Silver Birch tree is a common species, situated in a leafy suburb and has no particular cultural or historic interest, poorly positioned. Therefore the tree has minimal wider impact.

The City Arborist considers the tree to be in good condition, healthy with no major defects. It is of high amenity value, located in a prominent position within the rear garden, highly visible to and enjoyed by a significant number of occupiers of neighbouring residential properties and from vehicular traffic and pedestrians on Ryebank Road, in particular. The tree in question is an important element of the local landscape and its biodiversity and provides important screening across the rear gardens of neighbouring properties.

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 Silver Birch tree makes to the local environment. Whilst it is acknowledged that the reason for objecting to the TPO, in particular concerns about its visibility, individual impact and wider impact require 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 249 Ryebank Road, Chorlton, Manchester M21 9LX, 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.