



## Planning and Highways Committee

Date: Thursday, 30 May 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**

Nasrin Ali (Deputy Chair), Shaukat Ali, Clay, Curley (Chair), Dar, Kamal, Kirkpatrick, J Lovecy, Lyons, Madeleine Monaghan, Watson, White, Wilson, Davies, Hitchen and Riasat

## **Supplementary Agenda**

---

**1a Supplementary Information on Planning Applications on this agenda.**

5 - 16

The report of the Head of Planning, Building Control and Licencing is attached.

## Meeting Procedure

---

The meeting (and any site visits arising from the meeting) will be conducted in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Council's Constitution, including Part 6 - Section B "Planning Protocol for Members". A copy of the Constitution is available from the Council's website at [https://secure.manchester.gov.uk/downloads/download/4030/the\\_constitution](https://secure.manchester.gov.uk/downloads/download/4030/the_constitution).

At the beginning of the meeting the Chair will state if there any applications which the Chair is proposing should not be considered. This may be in response to a request by the applicant for the application to be deferred, or from officers wishing to have further discussions, or requests for a site visit. The Committee will decide whether to agree to the deferral. If deferred, an application will not be considered any further.

The Chair will explain to members of the public how the meeting will be conducted, as follows:

1. The Planning Officer will advise the meeting of any late representations that have been received since the report was written.
2. The officer will state at this stage if the recommendation of the Head of Planning in the printed report has changed.
3. ONE objector will be allowed to speak for up to 4 minutes. If a number of objectors wish to make representations on the same item, the Chair will invite them to nominate a spokesperson.
4. The Applicant, Agent or their representative will be allowed to speak for up to 4 minutes.
5. Members of the Council not on the Planning and Highways Committee will be able to speak for up to 4 minutes.
6. Members of the Planning and Highways Committee will be able to question the planning officer and respond to issues that have been raised. The representative of the Highways Services or the City Solicitor as appropriate may also respond to comments made.

Only members of the Planning and Highways Committee may ask questions relevant to the application of the officers. All other interested parties make statements only. The Committee having heard all the contributions will determine the application. The Committee's decision will in most cases be taken under delegated powers and will therefore be a final decision.

If the Committee decides it is minded to refuse an application, they must request the Head of Planning to consider its reasons for refusal and report back to the next meeting as to whether there were relevant planning considerations that could reasonably sustain a decision to be minded to refuse.

## Further Information

---

For help, advice and information about this meeting please contact the Committee Officer:

Beth Morgan

Tel: 0161 234 3043

Email: [b.morgan@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:b.morgan@manchester.gov.uk)

This supplementary agenda was issued on **30 May 2019** by the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit, Manchester City Council, Level 3, Town Hall Extension (Mount 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 30 May 2019**

**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 Head 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** 30 May 2019

**Item No.** 6

**Application Number** 122042/00/2018

**Ward** Levenshulme Ward

**Description and Address**

Outline planning application for the erection 57 dwellings, with all matters reserved expect for access, with associated access off Cringle Road, car parking, landscaping and other associated works

Land Off Cringle Road, Manchester

---

**1. Local residents/public opinion**

Eleven additional letters of objection have been received. The comments can be summarised as follows:

- Many residents cannot attend the meeting due to it being half term and other commitments. The matter should be deferred to allow for residents to attend;
- The applicant's ecologist did not have access to the buildings on site despite assertions that they have been assessed;
- Its states on page 9 of the ecologist report that access was not granted to the buildings due to them being in use which is contradictory of the ecologists point on page 3 that they were able to fully assess the land with no constraints;
- The ecologist states that no waterbodies exist north of the site within the country park for 450 m. There is a lake 340 m north of the site. If the ecologist is wrong in this regard how can other findings in the report be correct?
- The applicant's ecologist is not a bat specialist;
- The bat survey was carried out outside of the months April- September. Bat surveys cannot be carried out at these times of years as bats are in hibernation. It was also carried out in the day time;
- Green space is a rarity in Manchester and could lead to a trend for further green space to be lost in the Country Park;
- The development will add to the poor air quality in the area;
- The proposal will add to the congestion on the surrounding road network;
- The site consists of wildlife which will be disturbed as a result of the development;
- The affordable homes will not be truly affordable to those in need;
- The farm was an asset to the local community.

**2. Head of Planning**

The additional comments provided by local residents are noted. The printed report has considered in detail the impact the development will have on the local environment and local residents.

Recommended conditions of the planning approval are that each development shall provide an electric car charging point as well as provision for cycle storage. These features will seek to minimise the impact of the development on air quality in the local area.

The addendum report details that there will be additional traffic calming measures along Cringle Road to slow the traffic in order to ensure a safe pedestrian and highway environment.

The impact of the development on the ecology and biodiversity of the site has been carefully considered together with an assessment of the site for protected species. No evidence of any such species was found and the site was assessed as low risk for all such species including the risk of bats roosting within the building to be demolished. An inspection of the building was carried out by the applicant's ecologist and the findings were considered by the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) who have raised no objections.

A review of the ecology report prepared by the local resident was carried out by GMEU and whilst they remain of the view that there will be no harmful impacts on ecology as a result of the development and loss of buildings, they have recommended a condition which seeks to survey the buildings again prior to their demolition. This condition is contained within the printed report.

The recent Inspectors decision judged the application site to be of low recreational value and played no contribution to the wider landscape quality of the area. Whilst the proposal will alter the character of the local area, the scale of the new homes at the site is modest at two storeys and the retention of a significant amount of existing tree coverage, together with new tree planting, will ensure there is a mature landscaped setting to the site.

Mitigation will be secured as part of any planning permission for improvements to Highfield Country Park, the amount of which has increased since the April Committee, together with there being 20% on site affordable housing which will be offered on the basis of shared ownership. Both these matters will be secured by a legal agreement.

The recommendation remains **Minded to Approve** subject to the signing of a legal agreement

**APPENDIX TO AGENDA  
(LATE REPRESENTATIONS)**

|  |                                    |                 |               |
|--|------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Planning and Highways Committee</b> | 30 May 2019                        | <b>Item No.</b> | 11 & 12       |
| <b>Application Number</b>              | 122464/FO/2019 &<br>122466/FO/2019 | <b>Ward</b>     | Sharston Ward |

**Description and Address**

Erection of 2 no. 4 bedroom bungalows and 1 no. 2 bedroom bungalows with parking, gardens and amenity space

Land at Junction of Honford Road and Broadoak Road, Manchester; and

Erection of 4 no. two bed bungalows with associated parking and landscaping works

Land at Junction of Panfield Road and Broadoak Road, Manchester

**1. Local Residents/Public Opinion**

**Local Residents** – 28 letters of objection have been received in relation to both applications, the points raised are identical to both sites and are as follows:

- The importance of building social housing is recognised but insufficient effort has been taken to identify alternative sites or to work with the community of Wythenshawe where such housing could be built without ruining the character of the neighbourhood.
- Both proposal would be detrimental to the historic and present day character of the neighbourhood. Greens with houses around them are central to the character of this part of Wythenshawe. The garden city history of Wythenshawe can and should be maintained.
- These are the last public, accessible large green spaces in the area. Most other green spaces have already been built on apart from smaller patches of grass. These spaces are key to local health and well-being as they are some of the only places where people still spend time outdoors.
- These spaces are highly valued local informal play spaces for our children within a set of five busy main roads – Greenwood Road, Hollyhedge Road, Brownley Road, Poundswick Lane and Simonsway. For parents in the houses around the green they can let their children play on them with peace of mind.
- The alternative play areas suggested in the submitted Design and Access Statement are too far away: The Haverley Road Play Area is 600m away with no pedestrian crossing; Kirkup Gardens is at least 500m away and on the other side of Simonsway; children visiting Rodgers Park would need to cross the motorway; Hollyhedge Park is at least a kilometre away.

**Brownley Green Action Group – Have made the following comments:**

- The Case Officer dismisses the categorisation of these greens as ‘amenity green space’. This is a question of perception and it makes it sound as if these greens are not of any value. For local residents the spaces are highly valued and used regularly as informal play spaces and recreational space by children and other residents. The community have developed plans for the green spaces through a participatory design process and residents wanted to seek village green designation for the area but were informed that they could not begin this process while these planning applications are outstanding.
- There have been a significant number of accidents on the corner of Honford and Broadoak road area over the past ten years. In their submission to the planning department on behalf of local residents, Mums Mart community association did make the appeal that whatever else happens as a result of these applications something be done about these road safety issues for children and all the other local residents in the area. This was also a key issue that arose out of the survey that Mums Mart carried out about the developments.
- It is critical to assess the importance of these communal green spaces to our local community against the desperate need for social housing in the context of appalling health and poverty indicators for our immediate area. Our neighbourhood is ranked in the top 1% most deprived in England at 176 out of 32,844 LSOAs in the country. There are now many studies which highlight the vital importance of green space and shared communal spaces within short reach of local households for physical and mental well-being in people of all ages including children and the elderly.
- We are fully in support of the provision of more housing for social rent and especially adapted housing for people with particular needs. But this does not have to be situated on the last two communal spaces in a neighbourhood that is already shouldering the burden of extremely high levels of poverty and inequality. There are other places where these bungalows could be built. Wythenshawe Community Housing Group have developed extensively on other plots for private sales and rentals and could find other sites for these bungalows.
- The facts provided on distance and accessibility of alternative green or play space in the Case Officer’s reports are incorrect. Most of the Case Officers comments in this section reference a 2009 report titled “*The City Wide Open Space, Sport and Recreation study*” in relation to availability of space and distance to amenity green space for households which is ten years out of date. The distances to the alternative sites are much greater and involve the crossing of major roads.
- The green space that will be left remaining after the developments on either of these sites will no longer be large enough to fulfil the purposes that the greens are currently used for or for the larger community events that residents are beginning to plan for the area.

Wythenshawe Community Housing Group will not tolerate children playing on the greens in the same way.

We are aware of the desperate need for social housing and as a group we developed a compromise position and we have set this out for residents in the form of a petition asking Wythenshawe Community Housing Group to reduce the number of bungalows planned from 7 to 4. This would enable one of the two greens to be saved, or at least a more significant amount of green space on each green if residents preferred to negotiate with the housing group to distribute the bungalows equally across the two greens.

## **2. Ward Members**

**Councillor Madeline Monaghan** – Requests that both applications are deferred in order to allow a site visit to be undertaken on both sites.

**Councillor Tommy Judge** – Objects to both proposals on the following grounds:

- While there is a need for this type of accommodation more suitable locations would be preferable.
- The proposal would lead to the loss of the last two remaining green spaces on Broadoak Road and loss of local amenity.
- There have been a number of accidents/near misses surrounding Honford Green so there are concerns about the proposals' impact on highway safety.
- When Wythenshawe was constructed it was talked about as the Garden City, we are now in danger of losing that identity which will have a detrimental impact on local people.

## **3. Officer/Outside Bodies**

**Highway Services** – Have made the following comments:

122464/FO – The revised application reduces the number of bungalows and offers a total of 3 dwellings. Two car parking spaces are offered for each of the bungalows (200% provision) which is considered acceptable.

122466/FO – The location of the driveways has been slightly modified which is considered acceptable. The footpath from Broadoak Road has been removed but as there is an existing footway in this location pedestrian movements can be accommodated sufficiently.

A condition regarding off-site highway works to the pavements is also suggested for both applications.

## **4. Head of Planning - Further observations/comments**

Highway Safety – It is not anticipated that the proposals would generate significant traffic movements within the vicinity of the site so as to prove

detrimental to the existing levels of pedestrian and highway safety enjoyed on the adjoining roads. Notwithstanding this, it should be noted that a condition attached to application 122466/FO/2019 would require the existing traffic calming measures to be re-positioned.

Alternative Green Spaces – The concerns of local residents and the action group are noted. However, it is still considered that sufficient alternative spaces exist within acceptable distances, though it is acknowledged that some would involve the crossing of main roads.

Character of Wythenshawe – As has been detailed in the main body of the report, it is not considered that the proposals will have an unduly detrimental impact upon the character of the neighbourhood and Wythenshawe as a whole.

The recommendation remains **APPROVE** for both applications

The suggested off-site highway works conditions are as follows:

122464/FO/2019

*15) Prior to the commencement of above ground works, a detailed scheme for the installation of dropped kerbs and tactile pavements shall be submitted to and approved by the City Council as local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the dwellinghouses hereby approved are occupied.*

*Reason – In the interests of pedestrian and highway safety, pursuant to Policy DM1 in the Manchester Core Strategy.*

122466/FO/2019

*14) Prior to the commencement of above ground works, a detailed scheme for the off-site highway improvement works outlined below shall be submitted to and approved by the City Council as local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the dwellinghouses hereby approved are occupied.*

- *installation of new dropped crossings to facilitate driveway access*
- *re-positioning of existing traffic calming features on Panfield Road (to be agreed with MCCs Capital Programmes and Property Highways Team).*
- *widening of footway on Panfield Road*

*Reason – In the interests of pedestrian and highway safety, pursuant to Policy DM1 in the Manchester Core Strategy.*

**APPENDIX TO AGENDA  
(LATE REPRESENTATIONS)**

**Planning and Highways Committee** 30 May 2019

**Item No.** 13

**Application Number** 122638/FO/2018

**Ward** Woodhouse Park  
Ward

**Description and Address**

Development of a combined bussing and motor transport service centre consisting of a part single/part two storey motor transport building, a single storey bus washing building, provision of a public long stay car park (2,700 car parking spaces), amendments to the layout of Wilmslow Old Road, together with the provision of landscaping and surface water drainage infrastructure and the demolition of four residential properties (Vicarage Cottages).

Land To The South Of Wilmslow Old Road And To The West Aviation Viewing Park, Manchester, WA15 8XQ

---

**1. Applicant/Agent**

The applicant has submitted a bat and barn owl survey of Vicarage Cottages, the findings of which are as follows:

Bats – No.1 Vicarage Cottage has no bats present or evidence of bats recorded. Due to a limited number of features on the roof of the cottage this building is classed as having low bat roost potential. Notwithstanding this a single additional survey is recommended, either a dusk emergence survey or dawn re-entry survey to establish whether bats have inhabited the property prior to demolition.

Nos. 2 to 4 Vicarage Cottages have no bats present or evidence of bats recorded but due to number of external features these buildings are classed as having high bat roost potential and additional surveys are required. Nos. 2 to 4 Vicarage Cottages should be subject to three surveys, a combination of dusk emergence/dawn re-entry surveys. These surveys must be undertaken between May and September, with at least two of the surveys undertaken between May and August. The surveys must be spaced out as far as possible.

Barn Owls – There is no potential for barn owls due to lack of access points into the cottages. No further survey work required.

## 2. Officers/Outside Bodies

**Greater Manchester Ecology Unit** – The bat report has recommended additional surveys for all three cottages, two of which were regarded a high risk, requiring up to three additional emergence surveys and one as low risk requiring one additional survey. GMEU do not disagree with the findings of the report based on the photographs of the cottage, proximity to high value habitat and lack of alternative high value buildings.

Therefore GMEU recommend, in line with current guidance and case law, that prior to determination the findings of the emergence surveys are provided to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

## 3. Head of Planning - Further observations/comments

**Environmental Impact Assessment** – The applicant did subject a screening letter to determine whether or not an Environmental Impact Assessment was required. After detailed deliberation it was determined that while the development would have some impact on the surrounding area these would not be significant to warrant a formal Environmental Impact Assessment and they could be suitably mitigated against. Therefore, the opinion of the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, is that an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required in this instance.

**Impact on Heritage Assets (Loss of Vicarage Cottages)** – As has been detailed previously, Vicarage Cottages are not listed or within a conservation area and as such their loss is considered acceptable. It is noted that the four cottages have been in-situ for a considerable period of time, namely the 17<sup>th</sup> Century, and are not protected by any form of heritage listing. The houses appear to have little historical value as the setting within a rural hamlet has been eroded by the growth of the airport. On that basis and in this context the loss of the four houses is considered acceptable.

Their retention and continued use as housing has been suggested, as well as their use as airport related offices. In terms of their retention as housing, following the laying out of the car park and motor transport centre, Vicarage Cottages would be located within a secure Airport Operational Area. The strict security requirements would limit general access by the public (tenants and their vehicles) to the area, thereby rendering their continued use as houses impracticable.

Their use as offices has also been suggested, similarly to the future use of the listed Cloughbank Farm. However, in the case of Vicarage Cottages, their scale and internal layout do not lend themselves to such a conversion.

**Loss of the Two Barns** – Both barns, which date from the 20<sup>th</sup> Century and can be seen below, are of poor quality and their retention would not enhance the setting of the listed Cloughbank Farm. As a result there is no objection to their demolition.



**Ecology** – The findings of the bat and barn owl surveys are acknowledged. As condition no. 9 in the main body of the report already requires that further bat surveys to be undertaken there is no requirement to attach a specific condition in respect of Vicarage Cottages.

As stated within the main body of the report Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) require a minimum of two new ponds and associated terrestrial habitat to be provided as compensation for the harm caused to Great Crested Newts. The applicant has responded to this point by confirming the location of two new ponds and habitat. Given that GMEU have not confirmed that these details are acceptable an additional condition is recommended which states:

*“Notwithstanding the information and details submitted by the applicant, stamped as received on 20<sup>th</sup> May 2019, prior to the development commencing, details of Great Crested Newt mitigation (showing at least two ponds and associated terrestrial habitat) shall be submitted to and approved by the City Council as local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be provided prior to any works taking place and thereafter retained.*”

*Reason – To ensure the protection of habitat of species that are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 or as subsequently amended in order to comply with policy EN15 of the Core Strategy.”*

Following the findings of the Vicarage Cottages bat and barn owl survey it is recommended that condition no. 9 be amended to read as follows:

*“9) Any trees or buildings to be removed to facilitate the scheme shall be inspected for the possible presence of bats prior to removal work commencing. A methodology for the surveying of Vicarage Cottages, based on the details contained within the AECOM letter stamped as received on 29<sup>th</sup> May 2019, shall be submitted to and approved by the City Council as local planning authority and thereafter undertaken in accordance with those approved details.*”

*If bats are found to be present then all tree removal and demolition work shall cease and no further work shall proceed until a scheme to mitigate the impact on bats has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council as local planning authority. Any such scheme shall be implemented in full in accordance with the approved details and a timetable agreed in writing by the Council as local planning authority.*

*Reason - To ensure the protection of habitat of species that are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 or as subsequently amended in order to comply with policy EN15 of the Manchester Core Strategy.”*

The recommendation remains one of **APPROVE**.

This page is intentionally left blank