



## Planning and Highways Committee

Date: Thursday, 14 November 2019

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Council Chamber, Level 2, Town Hall Extension,  
Manchester

This is a supplementary agenda containing additional information about the business of the meeting that was not available when the agenda was published

### **Access to the Council Chamber**

Public access to the Council Chamber is on Level 2 of the Town Hall Extension, using the lift or stairs in the lobby of the Mount Street entrance to the Extension. That lobby can also be reached from the St. Peter's Square entrance and from Library Walk. **There is no public access from the Lloyd Street entrances of the Extension.**

### **Filming and broadcast of the meeting**

Meetings of the Planning and Highways Committee are 'webcast'. These meetings are filmed and broadcast live on the Internet. If you attend this meeting you should be aware that you might be filmed and included in that transmission.

## Membership of the Planning and Highways Committee

### **Councillors**

Curley (Chair), Nasrin Ali (Deputy Chair), Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Hitchen, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Madeleine Monaghan, Riasat, Watson and White

## Supplementary Agenda

---

4. **Minutes**

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 17 October 2019 (enclosed).

3 - 10

## Further Information

---

For help, advice and information about this meeting please contact the Committee Officer:  
Andrew Woods  
Tel: 0161 234 3011  
Email: [andrew.woods@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.woods@manchester.gov.uk)

This supplementary agenda was issued on **Tuesday, 12 December 2019** by the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit, Manchester City Council, Level 3, Town Hall Extension (Mount Street Elevation), Manchester M60 2LA

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 17 October 2019**

**Present:** Councillor Curley (Chair)

**Councillors:** Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Flanagan, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Madeleine Monaghan, Riasat, Watson and White

**Apologies:** Councillor Nasrin Ali, Y Dar, Davies and Hitchen

**Also present:** Councillors: M Dar, Douglas, Jeavons, Kilpatrick, Wheeler, Clay, Grimshaw, Karney, Wilson and Wright

#### **PH/19/90. Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

##### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/19/91. Minutes**

##### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 19 September 2019 as a correct record.

#### **PH/19/92. Membership Changes**

The Chair welcomed two new members to the Committee, Councillors Andrews and Flanagan, and thanked two former committee members, Councillors Clay and Wilson, for the service they had given to the work of the committee and the residents of the city.

#### **PH/19/93. 124181/VO/2019 - Former Central Retail Park Great Ancoats Street Manchester M4 6DJ - Ancoats and Beswick Ward**

This application was to retain the car park at the former Central Retail Park, Great Ancoats Street, Manchester as a public pay and display car park for a temporary period of two years.

The application site related to 1.5 hectares that was previously used as a 440 space car park as part of Central Retail Park, which had now been demolished. The land previously occupied by the retail units was not part of the site and was hoarded-off from the parking area. The original submission had been amended to reduce the temporary period from five years to two years, together with the removal of a

compound which was to the south western corner of the site and was being used by the Council as part of the improvement works to Great Ancoats Street. That was being taken forward under a separate planning application. Additional lighting would be provided within the north western and north eastern areas to ensure that the spaces were lit and safe to use in the evening. The location of CCTV and pay facilities remained to be confirmed as a management company had not yet been appointed. The car park would be accessed from the existing signalised junction at Great Ancoats Street and would operate on a 24-hour basis, 7 days a week.

The Planning Officer introduced the application and referred to the additional information included in the late representations submitted. The information included a submission from Lucy Powell MP and 15 additional objections including the grounds of these objections. In addition, a petition with over 10,000 signatures had been produced from the group 'TreesNotCars.com'. The petition contained key statistics and quotes from local parents in the area. The group believed that local residents would be negatively impacted by this application.

The Committee was addressed by a local resident who spoke as a representative of the 'TreesNotCars.com' group. She explained the group's objections to the application. She believed that when used as a car park for the retail park the site would have normally only had 20 to 30 cars on it, whereas with this proposal it would have 440, 24 hours of every day. She questioned the validity of the traffic management and air quality plans that had accompanied the application as the assessments had not taken into account traffic arising from football matches, concerts, at weekends and in the evenings. She argued that it was harmful to allow such a development next to a primary school, that the pollution arising from it and the vehicle movements could be harmful to the health of the children in the school, and that in doing so the Council would be acting contrary to its own declaration of a climate emergency in July.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee. She informed Members that the temporary use as a car park would be while proposals were being drawn up for the long-term regeneration of the retail park site. As the site had been previously used as a car park, this proposal was considered acceptable. There would be a neutral effect on levels of traffic and environmental impacts, including on air quality.

Councillor M Dar (Ward Councillor for Ancoats and Beswick) then addressed the Committee in objection to the application. He referred to the level of the local opposition to the proposal from the residents of the ward. He supported the objections of the residents and also felt that the proposed use would go against the Council's declaration of a climate emergency. He felt that under the 'Our Manchester' strategy the Committee should be listening to the voices of the local people and should refuse the application.

Planning Officers were invited to respond to the concerns raised in objection to the application. It was commented that the issues that had been raised were already contained within the report. It was stated that it was believed there had been a reduction in the number of car parking spaces within the city centre and the application before Committee would not result in any increase to the number of spaces available but would replace other surface car parks that had been

redeveloped. Officers also advised the Committee that there was no evidence to suggest that the application would result in an increase in the number of car journeys into the city centre. It was reiterated that the application was for a temporary period of two years.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to comment on the application. Members raised concerns in relation to air quality and concerns that this site was next to a primary school, and that the pattern of use under this proposal would be very different and heavier from the vehicle movements when the site was a retail park. They also felt it was important to ensure that a temporary consent was for two years and no longer. Members also felt that the use of the site should not discourage people from using public transport instead of driving a car into the city.

Councillor Flanagan proposed the following amendment, which was seconded by Councillor White:

“that the Committee is minded to approve the application subject to:

- the layout of the car park being amended so that the triangular area in closest proximity to New Islington Free School was not used for parking and instead was replaced with planting to increase the landscape buffer between the site and the school;
- that a commitment was given by the Council that the site would not be used as a car park for more than the proposed two years; and
- that any parking charges introduced did not undercut public transport costs to the city centre.”

The committee supported that amendment to the officer’s recommendation, and on that basis were minded to grant the temporary consent.

## **Decision**

Minded to approve the application, with the authority to approve the application delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report and the amendment proposed by the Committee.

### **PH/19/94. 124320/FH/2019 - 53 Kingston Road Manchester M20 2SB - Didsbury East Ward**

This application was deferred at the request of the applicant in order to allow for the preparation of a sample panel of the proposed brick tinting.

### **PH/19/95. 121460/FH/2018 - 53 Kingston Road Manchester M20 2SB - Didsbury East Ward**

This application was deferred at the request of the applicant in order to allow for the preparation of a sample panel of the proposed brick tinting.

**PH/19/96. 120607/FO/2018 - Platt Lane Complex Yew Tree Road Manchester M14 7UU - Fallowfield Ward**

This application had been formally withdrawn by the applicant in advance of the meeting.

**PH/19/97. 123757/VO/2019 - 53 Barlow Moor Road Manchester M20 6TP - Didsbury West Ward**

This application was for the retention of access onto a classified road. The application site related to an installed dropped kerb within the pavement to the front of number 53 Barlow Moor Road located approximately 200 metres to the west of Didsbury District Centre.

The Planning Officer introduced the application. He advised the Committee that the dropped-kerb was installed in November 2017 by the Council following a request by the owner of the property. As Barlow Moor Road was a classified road, planning permission was required for the formation, laying out and construction of a means of access to a highway. Following receipt of a complaint regarding the installation of the dropped kerb the Council's Highway Services had now submitted a planning application to regularise the installation that had taken place.

The Committee was addressed by a local resident who objected to the application. He explained the history of the development and why he believed that the installation of the drop kerb had been done without consent. He referred to a decision by the Local Government Ombudsman that the Council had been at fault for allowing the installation of the drop kerb to go ahead. He explained his knowledge of the use of the pavement, having lived nearby for 33 years, and why the installation of the drop kerb had created a very dangerous situation with the space insufficient to safely park a vehicle without obstructing the footway, making it too narrow for a wheelchair to pass by safely. He explained why the drop kerb and parking ramp were contrary to the requirements of building regulations.

Councillor R Kilpatrick (Ward Councillor for Didsbury West) then addressed the Committee in objection to the application and referred to how busy Barlow Moor Road is and the prevalence of mobility issues amongst local residents. He too said the driveway was not large enough to park a vehicle safely and that Greater Manchester Police had had to get involved to deal with the obstructions that the parked vehicles had been causing.

Planning Officers were invited to respond to the concerns raised in objection to the application. It was commented that planning permission was not being sought for parking a car on a private driveway, just the installation of the dropped-kerb.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to comment on the application.

Members were concerned that the existence of the drop-kerb was encouraging the use of the space in front of the house as a vehicle park, and that was leading to obstructions of the walkway, as was evident in the photographs in the officer's report.

The obstructions and the change of slope in the pavement were therefore making the walkway less safe for pedestrians and were harmful to the accessibility of the neighbourhood. Members were especially concerned about older and less able people trying to use the walkway, impeded by the parked vehicles and the change in the slope of the path.

Highways Officers advised the Committee that the concerns of Councillors were understood. He said that the site did present a difficult traffic situation and that the Highways service would not accept that a vehicle parked in front of the property should be able to overhang and partially block the footway. He stated that Highway Services had visited the site and were satisfied that an appropriately sized vehicle could park on the driveway without overhanging the pavement.

The members concluded that the application was detrimental to the safety of the public using the footway and requested that the Director of Planning bring a further report to the next meeting to address the concerns and with potential reasons for refusal.

### **Decision**

The Committee is minded to refuse the application for the reasons that the proposed drop-kerb would impact on the safety of the public in using the footpath directly in front of the property. The committee agreed that the proposal was therefore in conflict with policies Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles and Policy DM1 - Development Management.

(The Director of Planning was requested to submit a report which addresses the concerns raised and whether there are reasons for refusal which could be sustained.)

### **PH/19/98. 124313/FO/2019 - 67 Church Road Manchester M22 4WD - Northenden Ward**

This application related to the change of use to a café/bar of the ground floor of a two-storey end terrace property with cellar, and installation of rear fire escape door together with sundry ancillary alterations.

The property was located at the end of a commercial parade in a predominately residential area east of Northenden District Centre on the junction of Church Road and Consul Street. The site had historically been used as an off licence (Class A1), a hairdressers (Class A1) and an unauthorised yoga studio.

The officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted by the applicant that related to the proposed conditions on a consent, and also to further letters of objection.

No objectors were present.

The applicant's agent addressed the committee on the application. She described the application as providing a café bar for local people to enjoy. There was much local

support for the application. The proposal would be a vacant unit back into use and be a benefit to the local economy.

Members welcomed the proposed use of the premises, stating that the area would benefit from this type of establishment.

Planning Officers reported that the consent was for a temporary period of 18 months, and would have a restrictive condition controlling the hours that the premises could open

### **Decision**

The Committee approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted

[Councillor Madeline Monaghan was not present when the vote on this application took place]

### **PH/19/99. 121375/FO/2018 & 121447/FO/2018 - 20 - 36 High Street, Including Church Street Market Stalls and land Bound By The Northern Quarter Multi-Storey Carpark, Church Street and Red Lion Street, Manchester, M4 1QB - Piccadilly Ward**

This application was for the construction of a 22 storey building comprising 361 residential apartments, ground floor commercial floor space, associated landscaping, including new public realm and pedestrian route, together with servicing, cycle parking, access and other associated works following demolition of buildings at 20-22 and 24-26 High Street and 5 market stalls to Church Street and the erection of one and two storey market stalls for flexible commercial uses at ground and first floor (following demolition of a wall) and related access, landscaping and other associated works for a temporary five year period.

The proposals related to two sites which were inextricably linked. The first related to an island site measuring 0.35ha and bounded by High Street, Church Street, Birchin Lane and Bridgewater Place, in the south-west corner of the Smithfield Conservation Area, close to the Shudehill and Upper King Street Conservation Areas and immediately to the north of the Grade II Debenhams. The second was at the junction of Church Street and Red Lion Street adjacent to the Church Street Multi Storey Car Park and was on the edge of the Northern Quarter which contained a mix of commercial and residential uses including independent businesses that helped to distinguish the Northern Quarter from other parts the City Centre.

Councillor Douglas (Ward Councillor for Piccadilly) addressed the Committee in objection to the application. She raised three main concerns: the height and size of the building; the location of the development; and the heritage impact. She referred to the concerns of Historic England, and the impact of the loss of the Café Metro building, which she considered to be both a heritage and community asset, as well as a local employer. She said she would prefer a smaller and less imposing development on the site that would not result in the loss of the Café Metro building.



The Agent then addressed the Committee. He felt that at present the site was one of the poorest parts of the city centre and was making a negative contribution to the Conservation Area. He said that consultations undertaken by the applicant had supported the redevelopment of the site. All options to retain the Café Metro building had been examined but the constraints of the building had presented insurmountable challenges that it had not been possible to overcome. He said the new building would be considered a modern classic. He argued that the benefits of the development would outweigh and harms that would arise, articulating the many benefits of the scheme.

Planning Officers were invited to respond to the concerns raised in objection to the application. It was commented that the issues that had been raised were already contained within the report. The officer set out the benefits of the proposals and weighed those against the harm to the setting of the Conservation Area and the loss of the heritage asset. It was explained that officers had worked with the applicant to bring forward a building that was only as large as it needed to be to be viable.

Members raised concerns in relation to the loss of 20-22 High Street, the Café Metro building. It was proposed that the means of retain the façade of that building should be further examined.

In response to the concerns raised, Officers advised that the retention of the façade of that building could be examined, without an assurance being possible that a scheme that retained the façade of 20-22 High Street would still result in a viable development.

Councillor Flanagan proposed the following amendment, which was seconded by Councillor Andrews:

“The Committee is minded to approve the application subject to the Director of Planning fully investigating the feasibility of the retention of the façade of 20-22 High Street within the development proposals.”

He explained that he trusted the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee, would carefully examine how the façade could be retained so as to do the best for the city. The committee accepted that amendment to the Officer’s recommendation.

## **Decision**

The Committee was minded to approve the application, with the authority to approve delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee, subject to the signing of a s106 legal agreement relating to a contribution towards affordable housing, the conditions and reasons set out in the report and the amendment passed by the Committee to fully explore the potential to retain the façade of 20-22 High Street.

[Councillor Watson left the meeting during consideration of this application]

**PH/19/100. 121979/FO/2018 - Blackfriars House Parsonage Manchester M3 2JA  
- Deansgate Ward**

This application was for the change of use of part of ground floor from office to café, works to rooftop comprising erection of a rooftop extension for use as a restaurant and refurbishment of roof space to house ventilation equipment and create roof terrace with intensive green roof.

The proposal related Blackfriars House, an eight storey building bounded by Parsonage, Blackfriars Street, the River Irwell and Alexandra House. It was located in the Parsonage Gardens Conservation Area. Blackfriars House was a substantial office building built in 1923 and its principal elevations were in Portland Stone. The building was not listed but was considered a non-designated heritage asset and made a positive contribution to the conservation area. Alterations included the demolition of existing rooftop buildings to allow for a rooftop extension constructed from bronze coloured aluminium and curtain wall glazing, an associated roof terrace and a green roof. Alterations would also be made to the service entrance at ground floor level on Parsonage, to provide access to the roof level.

Councillor Jeavons (Ward Councillor for Deansgate) addressed the Committee in objection to the application and referred to the history of the proposals for this site and the extent of objection there had been to those proposals. He acknowledged that the scheme now before the Committee had addressed many of those objections and he commended the developer for that. He raised remaining concerns that he called on the Committee to examine in relation to noise and recycling, congestion, traffic and pollution.

The Agent then addressed the Committee. He informed Members that the development would benefit existing users of the building, provide high quality amenities for the wider community, and new employment opportunities. He explained how the proposals had evolved to address the objections that had arisen from earlier schemes. He confirmed that the applicant was willing to accept and comply with the proposed conditions to reduce the potential harm to local residents.

Planning Officers were invited to respond to the concerns raised in objection to the application. It was confirmed that the conditions on the scheme had been proposed to reduce any potential nuisance to neighbouring residents.

Members stressed the need to ensure that the proposals to include a 'green roof' had to be included as part of the development. Subject to that the Committee supported the application.

**Decision**

The Committee approves the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report

[Councillor Raisat left the meeting during consideration of this application]