



## **Planning and Highways Committee**

Date: Thursday, 2 September 2021

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Council Chamber, Level 2, Town Hall Extension

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.**

### **Face Mask / Track and Trace**

Visitors are encouraged to wear a face mask when moving around the building and to provide contact details for track and trace purposes.

### **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), Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Baker-Smith, Y Dar, Davies, Hutchinson, Kamal, Kirkpatrick, J Lovecy, Lyons, Riasat, Richards and Stogia

## Supplementary Agenda

---

- 1a. **Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**  
The report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licencing is enclosed.

3 - 18

## Further Information

---

For help, advice and information about this meeting please contact the Committee Officer:  
Ian Hinton-Smith  
Tel: 0161 234 3043  
Email: [ian.hinton-smith@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:ian.hinton-smith@manchester.gov.uk)

This supplementary agenda was issued on **Wednesday, 1 September 2021** by the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit, Manchester City Council, Level 3, Town Hall Extension (Lloyd Street Elevation), Manchester M60 2LA

**MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL**

**PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS**

**APPENDIX TO AGENDA  
(LATE REPRESENTATIONS)**

**on planning applications to be considered by  
the Planning and Highways Committee**

**at its meeting on 2 September 2021**

**This document contains a summary of any objections or other relevant representations received by the Department since the preparation of the published agenda. Where possible, it will also contain the Director of Planning, Building Control & Licensing's own brief comment. These summaries are prepared on the day before the Committee. Very late responses therefore have to be given orally.**

## APPENDIX TO AGENDA (LATE REPRESENTATIONS)

**Planning and Highways Committee** 2 September 2021

**Item No.** 5

**Application Number** 124234/FO/2019

**Ward** Didsbury West Ward

### **Description and Address**

Erection of a two storey office building and associated car parking following the demolition of the existing building

The Lodge Rear Of Old Town Hall, Lapwing Lane, Manchester, M20 2NR

---

### **1. Local Residents / Members of the public**

An additional letter of objection has been received; the comments are as follows:

- It is claimed that the building will just be for meeting spaces and extra offices, there will be no extra staff or new businesses so no additional employment. This seems highly dubious, their existing building is huge and obviously underused as they already sublet office space to another business, perhaps they could consider taking this back? The real question is why they are building a 3-storey building at enormous expense. This looks very much like a business venture/new revenue stream. The design is very similar to The Colony in Wilmslow which is a conference /events centre which even does weddings. One-off visitors, noisy events and likely evening and weekend use make this a potential nightmare for the community who live there and increased traffic impacts the safety of children and pets.
- The applicant's traffic plan contradicts itself. Parking is already woefully inadequate, this proposal means the applicants are losing spaces and expanding their premises while claiming there will be no extra staff or visitors - this sounds improbable. They have dozens of staff, 73% of whom drive in every day. There are up to 12 cars who overspill the car park and are parked on the road at the entry to the close, often causing an obstruction. This is a private road belonging to Raleigh Close to which Pabla and Pabla only have access by agreement. Raleigh Close could enforce blocking access pushing those cars, visitors and the inevitable extra due to the new building, onto already saturated surrounding streets.
- Whatever the claims made, in reality the building is 3 stories with large dormer windows facing directly into the windows of family homes a few meters away. It really isn't substantially smaller than the withdrawn application in 2019.

- Raleigh Close is a quiet, residential and community spirited development. The surrounding area is a dense residential area already under strain from congestion. The thought of a sizeable structure and potential new business imposed on a residential close, causing such disruption and loss of enjoyment is causing great distress and concern to all of the residents.

## 2. Director of Planning - Further observations/comments

The Executive Summary, which has been omitted from the main body of the report, is as follows:

**Executive Summary** – The applicant is proposing to demolish the single storey Lodge and replace it with a 2-storey building that would provide meeting and storage facilities for the existing solicitors' office that operates out of the Old Town Hall. The existing Lodge is shown in the image below. Nineteen letters of objection have been received from local residents, as well as from Cllrs Hilal and Leech and West Didsbury Residents Association. Objections have been raised in respect of design and the impact on residential amenity but the main concern is that the proposal would lead to an increase in cars parking on-street and a reduction in the existing parking spaces within the curtilage of the site. The number of parking spaces that exist within the site would remain at 15 and the applicants have stated that the proposed building is to be used for meeting and storage purposes and would not be used to house additional staff.



Photographs of the Lodge are appended at the end of this Late Representation.

**Car Parking Numbers** – To clarify, the number of parking spaces that exist within the curtilage of the site is 15. The original application (with the larger footprint) did result in a reduction in parking numbers, as referenced in the

“Description” section in the body of the main report. However, in reducing the footprint of the proposed building, the number of parking spaces that exist within the curtilage of the site would remain at 15.

**Condition no. 3** – Condition no. 3 has been reworded as follows, with the revised text in italics:

*3) The development hereby approved shall only be used as ancillary meeting and storage space for the business operating at the Old Town Hall and shall not be used as additional office floorspace and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class E of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended), or any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).*

Reason - In the interests of residential amenity and pedestrian and highway safety, pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

The Recommendation remains one of **APPROVE**.

## APPENDIX TO AGENDA (LATE REPRESENTATIONS)

**Planning and Highways Committee** 2 September 2021

**Item No.** 6

**Application Number** 124453/LO/2019

**Ward** Didsbury West  
Ward

### **Description and Address**

Listed Building Consent for the demolition of the existing building

The Lodge Rear Of Old Town Hall, Lapwing Lane, Manchester, M20 2NR

---

### **1. Director of Planning - Further observations**

The Executive Summary, which has been omitted from the main body of the report, is as follows:

**Executive Summary** – The applicant is seeking Listed Building Consent to demolish the Lodge in order to facilitate the erection of a 2-storey building to form ancillary meeting and storage space for the solicitors' office operating out of the Old Town Hall. Though the Lodge itself is not listed, as it is located within the curtilage of the Grade II listed Old Town Hall, Listed Building Consent is required to remove it. No objections have been received from local residents, though one has been received from West Didsbury Residents Association. They are concerned that given the design and scale of the proposed replacement building (ref. 124234/FO/2019), satisfactorily convincing case for demolition of the existing Lodge has not been made. The Manchester Conservation Areas and Historic Buildings Panel accepted the principle of the Lodge's demolition, given the modern interventions. In addition, they considered it to be of little significance and its loss would not damage the setting and appreciation of the Old Town Hall.

The recommendation remains one of: **APPROVE**.

## APPENDIX TO AGENDA (LATE REPRESENTATIONS)

**Planning and Highways Committee** 2 September 2021

**Item No.** 8

**Application Number** 124335/JO/2019

**Ward** Chorlton Ward

### **Description and Address**

Vary part b of Condition 3 attached to Decision Notice Reference 093164/FO/2010/S1 to have the floodlights operational for 24 occasions, in each period between 1 August and 31 May (relating to a football season) between the hours of 7pm and 10pm on weekdays.

West Didsbury And Chorlton Football Club, Brookburn Road, Manchester, M21 8FE

---

### **1. Chorlton Ward Members**

A statement has been received from the local ward members which is set out below:

West Didsbury and Chorlton AFC have become a victim of their own success. The club is a great community asset, with a growing junior club and makes wide-ranging contributions to local people and place, as the club have set out in their representations. The club's success and growth, in teams, fan-base and ambition, has however led to increasing questions as to whether it has outgrown the current site in Chorltonville, where the club moved to in the mid to late 1990s.

The volume of noise, people and traffic on match days has become an increasing cause for complaints and concern by local residents, most notably the residents of Chorltonville who live close to the grounds and the roads approaching the grounds.

Chorlton Councillors have sought to facilitate dialogue between the club and local residents and to help them find some common ground and solutions so as to enable the club to remain on site whilst reducing the levels of interference with resident's enjoyment of their private homes and residential amenity.

Unfortunately, no agreement could be found on the issue which is before the Committee today, namely an application by the club to increase the number of days they can use the floodlights, from 12 to 24.

In the weeks and days leading up to today we have received emails and calls from approximately 60 local residents raising their concerns about the levels of light, noise, traffic and general interference between the hours of 7-10pm



which will flow from increased use of the floodlights for midweek evening matches. In addition to the objections that were previously submitted by local residents and groups, these most notably refer to 'frequent huge noise peaks' that occur during matches with an ask that any site visit should take place during a match, and if that is not possible, that the Committee view a recording of a match so they can get a sense of the volume of noise, as well as taking into consideration the findings set out in the latest acoustic survey performed by Clement Acoustics.

Whilst we sympathise with the logistical challenges that can flow from adverse weather and the subsequent need to rearrange weekend games to take place midweek, we do not feel this justifies the subsequent loss of amenity to the occupiers of adjoining residential properties or the impact on nocturnal wildlife. A doubling in use of the floodlights, without addressing the ongoing concerns of residents around the levels of noise and light interference, would further tip the balance away from being a community-based football club, which can reasonably operate within a residential and Conservation area, towards the need for different grounds. We understand that in the circumstances that the club do need to exceed their permitted use of the floodlights, an ad hoc application can be made for one-off additional use for that purpose. That is the most appropriate compromise in the circumstances.

Members have also submitted a copy of an acoustic report prepared for residents detailed below, together with a youtube clip showing the impacts of a football match.

## **2. Local Residents**

Three further letters have been received making the following points.

- The football club claims to have been "good neighbours" the neighbours, strongly disagree and it is presumptive of the club to make such an incorrect statement without asking their opinion.
- Residents disagree with the findings of the applicant's noise report.
- Residents disagree with the conclusions in the submitted ecology report.
- Residents are concerned that the report implies that the football ground is no longer part of the Chorltonville estate and conservation area
- Residents feel that the conditions were put in place for good reasons and the circumstances and reasons to protect against loss of amenity have not changed. The passage of time is not sufficient grounds to allow a doubling of the floodlight usage and it is unreasonable to assume so.
- Residents dispute that the planning system can control the crowd size and therefore noise level.

- Residents are concerned over the lack of enforcement action taken in respect of the alleged breaches of planning control.
- Concern is expressed that planting carried out by the club will obscure views across the Mersey Valley.
- The club claim they require the floodlights to progress to the next level, at which point attendances will increase.
- The club employs semi-professional players and is therefore no longer an amateur club catering for local people.
- Approval of the application would encourage the club to continue breaching covenants attached to all properties in Chorltonville that require owners not to conduct or permit activities that cause disturbance to neighbouring properties.
- Should consent be granted conditions are requested that would allow the use of the floodlights by the men's 1<sup>st</sup> team and prevent the use of the floodlights by other clubs.
- An acoustic report commissioned by residents has been submitted. The report concludes that "It is therefore recommended that it would be appropriate to explore the option of mitigation measures to be put in place. Furthermore, the proposed increased usage of the football pitch would be expected to result in more frequent annoyance for residents, thus further negatively impacting the amenity of residential spaces."

A further letter containing screen shots from a decibel metre application on a phone has also been submitted.

### **3. Director of Planning - Further observations / modifications to conditions**

In response to the comments raised by the local resident:

The application has been considered on its merits and all supporting information has been taken into account in the decision to recommend approval. Colleagues in Environmental Health are satisfied any visual impacts from the additional use of the lights would not be unacceptable provided they are not used after 10pm. They are also satisfied that any additional noise from use of the pitch and associated spectators for those additional occasions would not be unduly harmful.

Compliance with any covenants is a land ownership issue outside of the scope of planning control. It is a matter for residents to take up with those benefitting from the covenant.

All complaints are investigated and, where appropriate, action is taken.

With regard to the suggested conditions, these would not be considered reasonable in planning terms as there is no difference between a match being played by a team from the club and one that does not involve the club.

In respect of the planting the club has advised that this was carried out on two occasions by “City of Trees” and involved planting indigenous species. The planting of trees and hedges does not require planning permission.

In respect of the acoustic report submitted by residents, the applicant’s survey has already been assessed by Environmental Protection and found to be acceptable and appropriate. As the use is lawful it would not be reasonable to impose further acoustic treatment measures for a proposed increase in the number of times that the floodlights can be used.

In the interests of clarity conditions 5 and 6 have been reworded as set out below.

*5) Within three months of the date of this consent the recommendations of the revised lighting report by ECS Consulting reference 22/074/LR/01/B received on 24 July 2020 in respect of shield and luminaire orientation shall be implemented in full, and a verification report submitted to the Council for approval and the approved works retained for as long as the floodlights are in use..*

*Reason - To protect the amenity of the occupiers of adjacent nearby residential accommodation pursuant to Core Strategy policy DM1.*

*6) Within three months of the date of this permission a scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing for the management and control of noise levels from the public address system. The scheme should be designed to manage and control the noise levels of the public address system. The approved scheme shall be implemented as part of the development and maintained thereafter*

*Reason - To protect the amenity of residents from excessive noise pursuant to Core Strategy policy DM1 and Save Unitary Development Plan policy DC26.*

## APPENDIX TO AGENDA (LATE REPRESENTATIONS)

**Planning and Highways Committee** 2 September 2021

**Item No.** 9

**Application Number** 129020/FO/2020

**Ward** Fallowfield Ward

### **Description and Address**

Erection of 1 no. 13 storey building and 1 no. part 4 and part 5 storey building to form purpose built student accommodation together with a single storey side and rear extension to the retained and refurbished Oakley Villa and conversion to form amenity and communal space together with associated landscaping, cycle parking, car parking and associated works following the demolition of existing office accommodation on the site

Oakley, 188 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 6LJ

---

### **1. Additional comments**

An additional representation has been received from the South East Fallowfield Residents Group following the publication of the committee report specifically relating to the Shakespeare Garden within Platt Fields Park and the images within the report pre and post development.

SEFRG were shocked to see the impact of both the tower building and wrap around building. It is even more dominant than they could have imagined.

SEFRG have forwarded photos of the Shakespeare Garden taken last Friday. This garden is completely cared for by volunteers and is a beautiful and much-loved area in Platt Fields, many people call it a hidden gem - it is sheltered, sunny and a quiet haven away from city life. This development, if granted, will completely blight the garden; the noise and light pollution, the overbearing nature of the buildings, the effect on the trees and the loss of sunlight would be devastating. For people who live in South East Fallowfield, the park is the only community resource we have -and it is a lifeline for many of us, especially those with little or no gardens - of which there are many. The garden is divided into quadrants and is bigger than these few photos suggest. When you enter the sunken garden, you come down some central steps and it is almost like entering an outside theatre. It was originally a walled, kitchen garden for Ashfields - a Georgian mansion which was demolished years ago.

The history of the gardens is very special and SEFRG believe it should be viewed as an heritage asset in the same way that the Villa itself is. There aren't many public Shakespearean Gardens around, most are in North America, one is in mainland Europe in Paris and there are just a few in the UK, including the one in Stratford, so it is quite a rarity. These gardens were mainly created to celebrate the tercentenary of Shakespeare's death in 1916

but due to the war, the ones in England are often a few years after. Ours is 1922 and we'll be celebrating next year with a series of events.

The woman behind ours is an absolute inspiration - her name was Rosa Grindon. In the 1911 census, she described herself as a suffragette and lecturer and she lived on Cecil Street. In reality she was more suffragist than suffragette, but she was a huge supporter of the suffrage movement. She was involved in many philanthropic activities in the city and a bronze plaque was made in memory of her and currently hangs in the central reference library - it describes her as 'a dedicated citizen'.

Rosa's two passions were Shakespeare and botany and our Shakespearean Garden is obviously a fusion of these interests. Apparently, she took cuttings from the garden at Stratford for ours. She also regularly lectured at the Shakespeare festivals in Stratford (sharing a stage with the likes of Ellen Terry) and usually talked about Shakespeare's depiction of women. She was married to the leading Manchester botanist, Leo Grindon and she gave the Shakespearean stained-glass window in the Central Ref to the city in his memory.

Our group who tend the garden are planning a series of events catering for local people; nature studies for local children, events linking to Platt Hall, theatrical performances, outside keep fit classes for older people, brass bands etc. If this development goes ahead, it will ruin all this. (Photographs of the Gardens supplied by SEFRG are appended below)

Much of this history of the garden was lost until recently. There are people who come into the garden every day, especially older people, and many of them have no idea about the planning application.







A further resident comment has been received which raises concerns regarding anti-social behaviour in Landcross Road Fallowfield. It is stated that a new PBSA 425 accommodation block, is unlikely to be a monastery in the sky. Resident students there, will only be too willing to join in the general mayhem in the area, exacerbating issues. As one of only 4 owner occupier residents left now out of 63 houses in Landcross Road Fallowfield all the rest are rented out (and the majority to students), pending the outcome of this application, I'm prepared to sell up and go.

## **2. Director of Planning – further observations**

Issues relating to the visual impacts of the proposals including on Platt Fields Park are set out within the printed Committee report. Whilst the Park does not have a specific designation or status in planning terms the visual impacts are

considered to be harmful for the reasons set out within the report and the recommended reasons for refusal.

Concerns arising from the proposed development and impacts of residential amenity are considered within the printed report, the proposals are not considered to make a positive contribution towards the creation of neighbourhoods of choice and this is reflected in the recommended reasons for refusal.

The recommendation remains to **REFUSE** the application.

## APPENDIX TO AGENDA (LATE REPRESENTATIONS)

**Planning and Highways Committee** 2 September 2021

**Item No.** 11

**Application Number** 130515/MO/2021

**Ward** Levenshulme Ward

### **Description and Address**

Reserved Matters Application for the approval of appearance, layout, scale and landscaping, following the approval of outline permission referenced 122042/OO/2018 for the erection 57 two storey dwellings with associated access off Cringle Road, car parking, landscaping, boundary treatment and other associated works

Land Off Cringle Road, Manchester

---

### **1. Public opinion**

One further objection has been received in respect of this matter. The comments can be summarised as follows:

- The area in question borders a natural nature park (Highfield park). This is a well-used and important part of the area for people that live locally. The area in question forms a beautiful green field used by horses for grazing and would be completely spoilt with the construction of 57 houses on the site;
- There is a large quantity of wildlife that make use of this area including protected bats and other endangered species;
- The path that runs alongside the proposed development is part of Manchester's sustainable transport network and this has had extensive work recently carried out on it to make it more attractive to the public. It provides a link to the Fallowfield loop - a cycle path that provides an essential off-road access point for pedestrians and cycle users as well as being developed for disabled persons. The development would hinder/disrupt and stop many members of the public from being able to enjoy this green area;
- The location of the development and Highfield park are one of the few natural and beautiful spots in Manchester that provides peace, comfort and tranquillity in an area already hemmed in with houses and urban concrete. Building another 'housing estate' here will reduce yet again the tiny green space there is left and have a severe detrimental impact on the enjoyment of the public to be able to use and enjoy it.



## 2. Director of Planning - Further Observations / Modifications to Conditions

The comments of the objector are noted. The impact of the development on Highfield Country Park, ecology and adjacent highway network were considered in detail at the Outline planning stage. In approving the development, the Planning Inspector did not consider that the development would have an unduly harmful impact on the setting of the Park nor did they consider that the use of the site for residential purposes was unacceptable.

Matters relating to bats was considered in detail and Greater Manchester Ecology Unit were satisfied that the development would not result any unacceptable impacts and mitigation could be secured.

It is not considered that the proposal would affect the operational efficiency of the adjacent cycle network.

The applicant has submitted revised plans in respect of the landscaping proposal. The changes are considered to be acceptable.

Condition 2 and 6 should be amended accordingly to include reference to drawings 101 Rev G (Landscape Layout), 202 Rev D (Planting Plan), 203 Rev D (Planting Plan) and 204 Rev D (Planting Plan) stamped as received by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, on the 25 August 2021 and L(-)14 rev.02 (Site Layout Boundary treatments) stamped as received by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, on the 31 August 2021.

In regard to condition no.2 this should also be amended to include reference to plan ref: L(-4) 300 (House C elevations).

In regard to condition no. 8 this should also be amended to include reference to plan ref: L(-)14 rev.02 (Site Layout Boundary treatments) stamped as received by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, on the 31 August 2021, and that the boundary treatment to the frontage of the houses shall be in accordance with the details on plan ref: L(-4)003 stamped as received by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, on the 6 August 2021.

The recommendation remains to **Approve** the application subject to the conditions in the report and changes detailed above.

## APPENDIX TO AGENDA (LATE REPRESENTATIONS)

**Planning and Highways Committee** 2 September 2021

**Item No.** 12

**Application Number** 129685/FO/2021

**Ward** Levenshulme Ward

### **Description and Address**

Change of use to form a 12 bedroom care home (Class C2)

209 Slade Lane, Manchester M19 2AE

---

### **1. Applicant further comments**

The applicant has agreed to the detail of the recommended conditions subject to an amendment to condition 7 and its required timescale for the installation of an electric vehicle (EV) charging point. Further discussion has been undertaken with the applicant who has agreed the following amendment to condition 7:

*Four weeks after the authorised use commences, a scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority, detailing the siting and specification of an electric vehicle charging point along with a timescale for its installation. The approved scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the agreed details (including the timescale for its installation) and maintained in situ at all times thereafter.*

*Reason - In the interests of residential amenity and the contribute to the reduction of carbon emissions and improve air quality, pursuant to policies SP1, EN16 and DM1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

### **2. Director of Planning – further observations**

It is considered that the amended condition would secure the delivery of an EV charging point within an appropriate timescale. The recommendation therefore remains one of APPROVE subject to the amendment to condition 7.