

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 31 May 2018**

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

**Councillors:** Shaukat Ali, Clay, Curley, Y Dar, Kamal, Kirkpatrick, Lovecy, Lyons, Madeleine Monaghan, Strong, Watson, White and Wilson

**Apologies:** Councillor Nasrin Ali

Also Present: Councillors Julie Reid, John Hughes, Mohamad Majid, Andrew Simcock, John Leach, Richard Kilpatrick and Rabnawaz Akbar

#### **PH/18/40 Minutes**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 12 April 2018 as a correct record.

#### **PH/18/41 119448/FO/2018 – Land Between 33 Chislehurst Street and 38 Greenhill Road, Manchester, M8 9ND**

Planning application 119448/FO/2018 for the creation of two car parking spaces for no.36 and no.38 Greenhill Road and associated boundary treatment.

The topography of the site is flat and is currently open to Chislehurst Street where there is a dropped kerb providing access to the application site. The application site is bounded by a concrete panel fence, of varying heights, on three sides. There are also two wooden gates providing access to the land from the rear gardens of 36 and 38 Greenhill Road.

The surrounding area is made up of predominantly residential terraced properties, the majority of which do not benefit from associated car parking. Properties 33 and 27 Chislehurst Street are the only properties in the street that have an area for car parking to the. There is also limited of street parking associated with the properties along Greenhill Road.

The proposal sought to use the land as two car parking spaces by incorporating the space into the rear gardens of 36 and 38 Greenhill Road.

The proposal would include sub dividing the land by erecting a dividing fence with associated 1.8 metre high wooden gates to Chislehurst Street.

The report of the Head of Planning set out the planning issues for the Committee to consider. No representations were received. The applicant did not attend the meeting. A spokesperson addressed the Committee on behalf of the residents on Greenhill Road objecting to this planning application and said that there were existing parking issues on Chislehurst Street and there was a layby for parking at No 26 to 38 Greenhill Road. Other issues raised included the issue of fly-tipping on the land

concerned and anti-social behaviour. In addition there was concern that the proposal will reduce the playing area and increase safety issues for local children.

Officers reported the proposal offered a secure parking space for the properties concerned. The fence and gates proposed was the optimum arrangement.

The Committee concluded that the proposals were satisfactory and decided to grant the application.

### **Decision**

To **approve** the application subject to the conditions and reasons detailed within the report.

*(Councillor Shaukat Ali declared a personal interest and did not take part in the decision and was not present for the discussion on the application.)*

### **PH/18/42 119149/FO/2018 - Land at Abbey Hey 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, residential amenity 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.

*(Councillor Kamal declared a personal and prejudicial interest as a Ward Councillor and having commented on the application and was not present for the vote on the request for the site visit.)*

### **PH/18/43 119472/FO/2018 – Land to the Rear of 32-37 and 38-43 Haniwells, Nail Street, Manchester, M19 2GY**

Planning Application 119472/FO/2018 for the erection of a two storey extension, to existing apartment block, to form an additional 4 two bedroom apartments, including alterations to the window openings of the existing apartments and alterations to the associated car parking and external gardens.

The proposed extension would project from the rear elevation to units 38 and 43 of the development by 16.4 metres and partially cover a section of brick paved courtyard parking and a communal grassed area within the north-west section of the application site. The proposed extension would be linked to the existing building to form an 'L-shaped configuration. The siting of the proposed extension would maintain a minimum distance of 12.5 metres and 14 metres to the respective northern and western site boundaries. This arrangement would allow the retention of existing trees along the western boundary. Taking account of a single storey rear extension to 17 Eastholme Road a minimum distance of 18.5 metres would be maintained from its

nearest point to the closest element of the to the closes part of the rear elevation to the proposed extension.

The proposed extension would be 2-storey with a continuous eaves height of 5 metres. The main section of pitched roof would rise to a height of 8.7 metres and project westwards by 14.4 metres before terminating in a partial gable elevation. The principal (northern) elevation would incorporate a projecting element with a width of 8.7 metres rising from ground level to the eaves: where a two section dormer feature above (incorporating ridge lines at 8.5 metres and 6.8 metres respectively) would be formed. A projecting element would be formed at the intersection of the proposed side (west) and rear (south) elevations: it would have a rearward projection of 1.5 metres and width of 4 metres. This rear element would have a hipped pitched roof with a maximum height of 7metres with eaves at 5.2 metres. The proposed elevational composition would reflect the existing building in terms of window styles and alignment, sill and lintel detailing and stone banding above ground floor level. Arched doorway and window detailing to reflect the existing would be incorporated into the projecting element of the northern elevation to highlight the proposed entrance.

Each apartment would comprise of: 2-bedrooms, living room, kitchen, bathroom, store room and hallway. Access would be gained through a communal corridor and stairway linked to the main entrance.

Externally, the car parking area would be reconfigured resulting in the realignment of 6 existing spaces and formation of 2 additional spaces adjacent to the northern boundary with 2 further parking spaces to be located adjacent to proposed western elevation of the extension. A four space cycle storage area has also been indicated adjacent to the western elevation.

The report of the Head of Planning set out the planning issues for the Committee to consider. A late representation was received from objectors to the proposal and Councillor Noor. The applicant did not attend the meeting. No objectors spoke against the proposal.

The Committee concluded that the proposals were satisfactory and decided to grant the application.

### **Decision**

To **approve** the application subject to the conditions and reasons detailed within the report.

**PH/18/44     116582/FO/2017 - 14-16 Birch Lane, Manchester, M13 0NN**

Planning Application 116582/FO/2017 for the erection of two detached residential blocks of 4 and 3 storeys forming a total of 28 apartments (27 x two bedroom and 1 x three bedroom) with car parking (28 in basement and 2 at surface level), cycle parking, communal gardens and landscaping, new access arrangements boundary treatments, waste management areas and site security offices following demolition of the existing building. The application site is comprised of a rectangular piece of land

measuring approximately 2,214 sqm with the address of 14-16 Birch Lane, Longsight. The application site has street frontages to both Birch Lane to the front and Clarence Road to the rear.

The two residential blocks consist of Block A which fronts onto Birch Lane and is 3.5 storeys in height and Block B which fronts onto Clarence Road and is 2.5 storeys in height.

There are 28 apartments in total with 27 no. 2 bedroom apartments and 1 no. 3 bedroom apartment with 30 car parking spaces being provided. This includes 28 parking spaces (including two disabled spaces) located within the central secure basement car park, which is accessed from a vehicular access ramp off Birch Lane. The car park would extend beneath both the proposed blocks with access from the basement area to the respective residential accommodation above would be provided by a lift in each block. There are also a further two disabled visitor spaces located to the front of the building onto Birch Lane. There are two secure cycle stores within the basement car park providing 28 spaces. Block B contains a security office on the ground floor overlooking the garden area for added security and Block A contains a management office also on the ground floor overlooking the garden area.

The central area of the site is then given over to a large communal and private outdoor amenity garden for the occupants of the development. The development includes a comprehensive landscaping scheme and good quality boundary treatments around the entire site.

The report of the Head of Planning set out the planning issues for the Committee to consider. The Committee noted that an amendment would be made to Condition 15 with the inclusion of "any other associated highway works". No late representation was received on the proposal. The applicant did not attend the meeting. No objectors spoke against the proposal.

The Committee sought clarification regarding the viability and affordable housing assessment made on the application under Policy H8. Officers reported that a viability test was undertaken which demonstrated that the scheme would be undeliverable if affordable housing was to be provided; however, since the application had been submitted it had been established that the applicant was the owner of the site prior 1 December 2007 and therefore, met the exceptionality test complying with Core Strategy Policies H1 and H8 in so far as no affordable housing would be required.. In this instance there is therefore no requirement to provide affordable housing or provide a contribution as part of the scheme. The Committee noted that if sold any time in the future, this specific exceptionality test would no longer apply to any new applications coming forward for the site.

The Committee commented that the application was a large development and in view of the density of the development of the area had consideration been given to a smaller scale development. Officers reported that as part of the planning process consideration had been given to the visual impact of the scheme to ensure that an in-scale and balanced development was produced with adequate parking.

The Committee sought assurance that plans were in place to properly address the issue of dust created by the construction works on the development. The Committee

was informed that the conditions included required an appropriate management construction plan to be in place. A construction plan had been produced and assessed and would be subject to enforcement action in the event of subsequent breaches during construction work.

The Committee concluded that the proposals were satisfactory and decided to grant the application.

### **Decision**

To **approve** the application subject to the conditions (as amended in Condition 15) and reasons detailed within the report.

#### **PH/18/45 117864/FO/2017 - 1 Deansgate, Manchester, M3 1AZ**

Application 117864/FO/2017 for the use of the part ground and part mezzanine floors as a gymnasium (Use Class D2), the replacement of frosted glazing panels with clear glazing panels and the creation of a new entrance on the Deansgate elevation.

The site was built in 2002 and is bounded by Deansgate, Cateaton Street, New Cathedral Street and St Mary's Gate. It contains 84 apartments on 14 upper floors with a mix of uses on the ground floor including shops, travel agencies, estate agencies, hair dressers and a bank.

The building is not within a Conservation Area, but is located between the St Ann's Square Conservation Area and the Cathedral Conservation Area and is diagonally opposite the Grade II Listed Royal Exchange. Other uses in the immediate area include Manchester Cathedral, a hotel, offices, the Arndale Centre, a theatre, apartments, shops, bars and restaurants.

Planning permission is sought to use part of the mezzanine floor of the podium of the building as a gym (Use Class D2). The main entrance to the gym would be created within a glazed panel and would be of frameless glazing and flush to match other doors at the property. Level access would be provided via an alternative entry point and passenger lift that is located further down the Deansgate frontage. Four obscure glazed panels on the Deansgate elevation of the building would also be replaced with clear glazing.

The proposed opening hours of the gym are:

06:00 to 22:00 – Monday to Friday

08:00 to 17:00 – Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays

The maximum capacity of the gym would be 30 customers at any one time.

The report of the Head of Planning set out the planning issues for the Committee to consider. One late representation was received objecting to the proposal which were addressed within the report submitted. The applicant attended the meeting but did not speak. No objectors spoke against the proposal.

The Committee sought clarity regarding disabled access to the building. Officers reported that there would be two access points. This would include a specific access point for the gym located on the first floor in addition there will be a lift access to the gym accessed via the commercial side of the building.

The Committee requested further clarity regarding comments made in the late representation on the acoustic report and potential problems in dealing with noise after approval had been given. Officers reported that Condition 3 included a requirement as recommended within the acoustic survey for a verification report and post testing to ensure compliance with the specified noise criteria. The Committee concluded that the proposals were satisfactory and decided to grant the application.

### **Decision**

To **approve** the application subject to the conditions and reasons detailed within the report.

#### **PH/18/46 117280/FO/2017- Land At Spear Street, Manchester**

Application for the erection of an eight storey building to provide 11 no. residential apartments (Use Class C3) (8 x 1 bed and 3 x 2 bed) above ground floor entrance lobby, private roof terraces for 2 apartments at 8th floor level, cycle parking (12 x spaces), refuse storey and plant room.

### **Decision**

To defer consideration of the matter due to technical issues relating to the application.

#### **PH/18/47 118267/FO/2017- Land At Chandos Hall Between Echo Street, Granby Row, Vimto Gardens And Manchester South Junction And Altrincham Railway Viaduct, Manchester, M1 3QJ**

Application for full planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings on site and their replacement with a mixed use (sui generis) development comprising 3 towers ranging in height (from: 14, 20 and to 25 storeys (including lower ground floor level) and intermediary link buildings and providing: 403 units of Co-Living residential accommodation with associated shared amenity spaces; 94 units of purpose built student accommodation with associated shared amenity spaces; ground floor commercial floor space and children's day nursery together with cycle parking, recycling and refuse bin storage, associated plant and public realm enhancements to Granby Row, Echo Street, Cobourg Street and Back Acton Street

The proposal involves the redevelopment of the site incorporating two distinct elements, namely purpose built student accommodation and a concept known as co-living which is described below. The uses would be inextricably linked and mutually supportive to create a sense of place and a community which enables creativity to flourish. The Greater Manchester Strategy for Internationalisation (2017-20) identifies the critical importance for the City and the Region to increase its UK share of

international students and to attract and retain the very best talent from around the world in order to continue its success in the global market place.

The scheme comprises a podium with 3 taller elements of 14, 20 and 25 storeys. The lowest element would be adjacent to Vimto Gardens with the height increasing towards Piccadilly Station. Green roofs would provide recreation / social space for residents and encourage biodiversity and brown roofs would comprise biodiverse elements. The green and brown roofs would function as blue roofs to assist with the storage of rainwater as part of the drainage strategy.

The development would have a regular façade rhythm with windows grouped vertically. Window reveals would be chamfered with metal detailing and perforated metal spandrel panels. The principle building material would be red/purple brickwork which would respond to colours and materials found in the conservation area. The intermediate blocks would use white GRC panels to relate to the white/glazed bricks used in secondary or rear elevations of buildings within the conservation area.

Fully glazed, double height facades to Granby Row and Vimto Gardens and ground floor active uses would animate and activate the street-scene. New public realm would be created adjacent to the Gardens and within Granby Row, Cobourg Street, Back Action Street and Echo Street which would help to integrate the scheme into its context.

Granby Row would be re-aligned and narrowed to create a more attractive pedestrian environment. It would incorporate parking bays including two for disabled people, along with street trees and cycle stands. It would allow for tables and chairs to be provided outside the F&B unit on Granby Row and facing Vimto Gardens. The green and brown roofs and courtyards would contain soft landscaping, with native planting.

Vehicular access for maintenance vehicles would be from Echo Street via a ramp to the rear of the building. A total of 322 cycle parking spaces would be provided at lower ground floor level. These would be allocated as follows:

- 10% would be allocated to students (32 spaces)
- 45% would be allocated to residents of the Co-Living component (142 spaces) to store their own bicycle.
- 45% would be utilised as a cycle hire facility (148 spaces). The cycle hire facility would be operated by iQ and the basis of its operation would be as follows:
  - 148 bicycles would be purchased and stored within a designated section of the basement storage area.

The bicycles would be made available for hire to residents of either the student accommodation or Co-Living accommodation subject to them joining the Echo Street Cycle Club. Membership of the cycle club would be free.

The report of the Head of Planning set out the planning issues for the Committee to consider. Late representations were received objecting to the proposal and sought

listing and retention of Chandos Hall in view of the building's historic value to the city and those who have worked and studied at UMIST. Further officer comments were included seeking amendment to Condition 2 and the deletion of Condition 31.

The applicant attended the meeting and spoke in favour of the application explaining that it would provide affordable purpose built Co-living residential accommodation and student accommodation. The development would further promote Manchester in attracting talented young professionals in the digital IT and creative sectors to the heart of the city. The proposal also builds on the Greater Manchester Strategy to enhance Manchester's place in the global market place and the Manchester Core Strategy. The development has received support from Historic England and the applicant believes that it is sensitive and compliments the location and surrounding buildings. The proposal would include the relocation and retention of Echoes Day Nursery to an adjacent building ensuring its continued use by residents and workers.

A spokesperson addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents against the proposal. Reference was made to the green space on Granby Row and the use of red brick as part of the proposal. The height of the proposed development is considered too high for the area compared to existing surrounding buildings and is overbearing.

Officers responded to the points raised on the design and impact of the scheme and the height of the building. The Committee was informed that the likely change of the area concerned would include applications for tall buildings in an area that required regeneration. Officers had considered all the impacts of the proposal on the area and considered the proposal to be acceptable. The demand for accommodation for new graduates to retain them in the city and attract students and graduates.

The Committee welcomed the concept Co-living but there was some concern on the height of the building proposed and how this may impact on the sunlight to the north of the area. Reference was also made to the housing of the nursery within the building and whether it would be available in the future as part of the shared amenities.

Officers reported that the nursery would be relocated and there was the option of remaining in the new accommodation if desired or returning to the new building. The height of the building had been considered in the context of its position as a gateway into the city centre and on this basis it was not excessive in comparison to other tall buildings within the city centre. Daylight and sunlight evaluations had been undertaken and it was accepted that city centre buildings will be effected to a degree by new buildings, however it was considered to be acceptable in this instance.

The Committee referred to disabled parking spaces as part of the development, bed spaces provided and evidence to support the potential release of other family accommodation within the city.

Officers reported there would be two additional disabled parking provided on Granby Row. The bed space referred specifically to bedrooms. The release of family accommodation within the report was anecdotal and not based on specific evidence.



The Committee referred to the scheme and whether it could have been produced on a smaller scale. Reference was also made to the comments received from the Manchester Conservation Areas and Historic Buildings Panel Officers and officers were asked if there is an impact on the historic value of the site in view of the conservation area status it holds.

Officers reported that the Committee would need to make a determination on the proposal submitted and whether it was a suitable development. It was reported that a conservation area will change as new developments were introduced and this should also be considered in the context of the existing buildings on site that detract from the conservation area. It was considered that the development proposed would have a positive impact and improve it in terms of the quality and design of the building.

The Committee asked if waste and recycling facilities would be provided for each apartment. Officers confirmed that this would be the arrangement.

### **Decision**

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

#### **PH/18/48 118025/FO/2017- 98 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 5AL**

Application for a change of use from former exhaust/tyre fitting centre (Class B2) to cafe (Class A3) with associated elevational alterations, waste storage, cycle storage and car parking.

The application had been deferred from the meeting of the Committee on 8 March 2018 to allow a site visit to take place. The applicant also submitted additional information in the form of a new acoustics report and a Management and Operations Plan which relates to how the business will seek to limit the impacts of the proposed use on nearby residents. The applicant provided additional assurances in relation to the future use of the premises and has stated that there is no intention to use the premises for shisha smoking. It has been necessary to assess the submitted additional information fully and the matters were referred to within the report submitted. Following assessment and subject to appropriate conditions, the recommendation was changed from refusal to approval.

The report of the Head of Planning set out the planning issues for the Committee to consider. A late representation was received in objection to the application regarding the impact on the local area, highway and parking concerns, litter and access and egress noise at the premises caused by patrons. Issues were also raised as part of the site visit and these were referred to in the report submitted.

A spokesperson from Platt Claremont Residents Association addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents against the proposal. Reference was made covering aspects of the new development, on-street car parking and the limited parking on the site. Parking is an ongoing issue in the area caused by visitors to food establishments in the area. Residents were concerned on the time taken to develop the application to an acceptable form and requested assurance that enforcement

would be taken quickly if conditions were breached. A further concern was raised regarding the use of a kitchen to prepare food rather than heat food as was previously understood was the proposal.

The applicant spoke in support of the application and gave assurance that the premises would be open as a restaurant and would not replicate the previous uses of site. No alcohol would be served and the hours of opening would be reduced. There would be fifteen staff employed. The applicant had worked extensively with the planning department to ensure that a suitable scheme was produced.

Ward Councillor Mahamed spoke to highlight the concerns of local residents on the change of use and to the general condition of the area. Issues such as noise, litter and inconsiderate parking were reported as the main concerns due to the nature of the business proposed for the premises.

Officers responded to the points raised and reported that enforcement action would be taken if there was evidence of any of the conditions being breached, including the use of shisha pipes. It was confirmed that a kitchen is shown on the plan and this would be left to the applicant to decide how food was prepared.

The Committee referred to the cumulative impact of the development on the area in term of parking arrangements and waste generated. Assurance was also sought that Condition 5 will be strengthened to ensure that the premises was not used for shisha pipes.

Officers reported that the management plan submitted and the parking arrangements provided an assurance that the proposal for premises was acceptable in view of the location and proximity to main access routes.

## **Decision**

1. To **approve** the application subject to the conditions and reasons detailed within the report and the late representation.
2. To delegate authority to the Head of Planning, Licensing and Building Control in consultation with the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee to agree the amendment to Planning Condition 5 of the application to ensure that the premises concerned is not used for the smoking of shisha pipes.

### **PH/18/49     118882/FO/2018 - Scotscroft Building, Towers Business Park, Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M20 2RY**

Application for the installation of LED screen and associated audio equipment.

Scotscroft Building is a three storey office building located at the centre of the Towers Business Park, which is located off Wilmslow Road and within the Didsbury St James Conservation Area. Consisting predominantly of Class B1 office accommodation there is an estate café/coffee shop on the ground floor. The Towers Business Park consists of ten modern office blocks and The Towers, a 19<sup>th</sup> Century former residence which has been used as offices since the 1920s. The office buildings sit

within a maturely landscaped setting that is punctuated with estate roads and associated parking facilities.

The applicant proposed to install an 8m<sup>2</sup> LED screen on the western elevation of the Scotscroft Building. The bottom of the screen will be located 1.81 metres above the ground floor at the entrance to the building and will measure 2.08 metres high by 3.84 metres wide. Two associated speakers would be located on either side of the LED screen. The Scotscroft Building is shown on the right in the photograph overleaf, with the location of the LED screen annotated by a cross.

The report of the Head of Planning set out the planning issues for the Committee to consider. A late representation was received raised concerns to the noise restrictions suggested by Environmental Health.

Councillor Leech (not a ward councillor) spoke in objection to the application and raised issues regarding the accessibility of the site, the noise created by people watching the screen and the refuse that would be produced. Car parking would also be an issue in streets close to the site.

The applicant spoke in favour of the application and explained the proposed uses of the screen and site. The screen would be 150 metres from residential properties also the existing trees would limit noise levels and sight of the screen from residential properties. The site is a well-established employment area.

The Committee proposed that the Planning Condition 3 be amended to grant a one year temporary approval to allow the Council to undertake a review of the operation of the facility.

## **Decision**

To **approve** the application for one year, subject to the conditions (as amended) and reasons detailed within the report and late representation.

### **PH/18/50 118294/FO/2017- 13 Oaker Avenue, Manchester, M20 2XH**

Application for the erection of 2no. part single/part three storey detached dwellinghouses following demolition of existing dormer bungalow including associated hardstanding, landscaping and boundary treatment.

The applicant is proposing to demolish the bungalow and erect two part single/part three storey dwellings (2 traditional storeys with accommodation in the roofspace) on the site. A total of six bedrooms is proposed for each dwelling though the submitted drawings give some flexibility as bedroom six is annotated as "bed 6/play". Both properties will be accessed off Oaker Avenue, with separate pedestrian accesses and driveways leading to a garage located at the side of each dwelling. The two new vehicular driveways will be provided in the centre of the existing brick boundary wall, away from the mature street trees that are in close proximity to the existing driveways. The existing vehicular accesses will be closed off and bricked up, apart for the provision of a pedestrian gate, to mirror the brick boundary wall which is to be

retained along the majority of the frontage. To facilitate the proposal ten individual trees and four groups of trees will be felled.

The report of the Head of Planning set out the planning issues for the Committee to consider. A late representation was received raising a number of concerns to the application and these included:

- Overshadowing of no. 11 Oaker Avenue
- Adequate parking space
- Three storey properties are larger than the typical semi-detached properties on this street.
- The existing proposal maintains the kerbside trees which are distinctive for this road, there is concern that the future conversion of the dwellings into flats would change the access requirements leading to the loss of the trees.
- The granting of approval for 3 storey houses would set a dangerous precedent given the existing mix of single-storey and two-storey houses in the proximity of the site along Oaker Avenue.
- There is no objection in principle, a two-storey proposal would, subject to detail, meet with support.
- Any re-development should be in proportion to the neighbouring properties and sympathetic to the character and aesthetics of the road.
- Loss of green amenity
- Roosting bats
- Nesting birds

A spokesperson addressed the Committee on the objections made and stated that the application was not in keeping with the area, the size of the proposed garden space was too small. The building line was 7.2 metres and there would be a loss of light and privacy.

The applicant spoke in favour of the application and outlined the proposed development.

Councillor Kilpatrick (Ward Councillor) spoke in opposition to the application and outlined concerns on the overdevelopment of the site in comparison the surrounding properties and area. The loss of trees was raised and the impact on the ecology of the site in particular birds and bats this would bring.

Councillor Leech (Ward Councillor) spoke and endorsed the concerns expressed in particular the size and height of the proposal and lack of garden and loss of trees on the site. Concern was expressed on the potential future use of the site as flat and the loss of privacy and on street parking issues in the area.

Officers responded to the points raised and explained how the assessment was made to the density of the application rather than the size of the development. Sub division of the property would require a further application and a condition could be added to address HMO use (C3 to C4).

The Committee welcomed the addition of a condition on the potential change of use and asked if more could be done to prevent tree loss.

Officers reported that trees were retained where possible

### **Decision**

1. To **approve** the application subject to the conditions and reasons detailed within the report.
2. To approve an additional Condition to prevent the future use of the property as a House in Multiple Occupation.

**PH/18/51      119701/JO/2018 - Norbrook Youth Club, Bordley Walk, Manchester, M23 0AR**

Application for the variation of condition no. 4 attached to planning permission 086382/FO/2008/S2 to allow the premises to open between 9.00am to 9.00pm Mondays to Tuesday, Thursdays to Saturdays and 9.00am to 10.00pm on Wednesdays.

In order to meet the needs of the young people in the area and to match the youth work delivery times at two other youth centres in Wythenshawe, the applicant is now proposing to vary the wording of condition no. 4 in order to allow the premises to open for an extra hour on Wednesday evenings. As a result the proposed wording for condition no. 4 reads as follows:

- 4) The premises shall not be open outside the following hours:-
  - a. 9.00am to 9.00pm Mondays to Tuesday, Thursdays to Saturdays
  - b. 9.00am to 10.00pm on Wednesdays

The report of the Head of Planning set out the planning issues for the Committee to consider. No late representation was received.

The Committee welcomed the application to extend the opening hours of the youth club.

### **Decision**

To **approve** the application subject to the conditions and reasons detailed within the report.