

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 17 January 2019

Present: Councillor Ellison (Chair)

Councillors: Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Clay, Curley, Dar, Kamal, Kirkpatrick, J Lovecy, Lyons, Madeleine Monaghan, Watson, White and Wilson

Apologies: None

Also present: Councillors: Newman

PH/19/1. Supplementary Information on Planning Applications on this agenda.

To receive the Late Representations.

Decision

To receive and note the Late Representations.

PH/19/2. Minutes

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2018 as a correct record.

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2018 as a correct record.

PH/19/3. 121647/FO/2018 - 1 - 4 Sagar Street Manchester M8 8EU

The Committee undertook a site visit prior to the meeting.

Councillor S Ali having declared an interest addressed the Committee as a Ward member and withdrew from the meeting whilst the item was discussed and determined)

The application site relates to an existing, two storey, flat roof building which occupies an end terrace position at the corner of Bury New Road and Sagar Street.

The building contrasts to the Victorian design of the host terrace and incorporates a flat roof design, with the front and side elevations clad with 'Cobalt Blue' Trespa cladding panels. Traditional red brickwork forms the rear elevation.

Officers advised the Committee that the construction of the extra storage space would result in an additional 3 delivery trips per day, which was considered acceptable. In addition, officers advised the Committee that servicing would be managed by way of a condition, and that the waste management and servicing arrangements were considered acceptable. Officers confirmed that there were existing issues with fly tipping but advised that these were outside of the remit of the Committee and were a management issue for the local neighbourhood team.

A representative of a local business spoke in objection to the proposals and said that the main area of concern was deliveries and servicing. He said that the applicant had submitted that the main purpose of the businesses was as a showroom with limited storage, but the resident said that this was contradictory with the stated need for storage as a showroom should not need more storage. He said that the current delivery and service arrangements were dangerous for both pedestrians and other road users, and that even just 3 more trips a day would make this worse.

He also explained that the larger vehicles blocked access for the other businesses at the site, for up to 20 minutes at a time. He also pointed out that there were several empty storage units in the vicinity which should be more economically viable to increase storage.

The applicant spoke to the Committee and said that they have fewer deliveries than the other traders at the site. He also said that another reason for the application is to improve the current flat roof which is difficult to maintain satisfactorily. He added that the other units around his building are all a story higher than his building and the problems with the flat roof are made worse by rainwater run off from the other buildings. In addition to the structural improvements, the proposals would improve the visual amenity of the site and therefore add value to the area.

Councillor S Ali spoke in objection to the proposals and said that while he had sympathy for the applicant, any approval would result in an increase in vehicle movements along a very narrow dead end street. He said that vehicles have to reverse back onto a main arterial route which was very dangerous indeed. He also said that the main road had been designated as the intended route of the B-Line Cycle Route, which would further present danger to other road users.

Officers confirmed that the B-Line Cycle Route proposal was at a very early stage of planning, and that any potential routes would be fully risk assessed before any cycle routes were installed.

Officers confirmed that the service plan that has been lodged as part of Condition 5 does contain a clause requiring that servicing is carried out with vans. As a result, if larger vehicles were used on a regular basis, this condition could be enforced by officers. Officers also agreed to further negotiate specific hours of servicing to ensure that this took place outside of peak times.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions in the report and a further condition which requires servicing to outside of peak hours.

(Councillor S Ali declared a prejudicial interest in this item and took no part in the debate or the decision, and left the room while the decision was made)

PH/19/4. 121401/FO/2018 - Land Adjacent To Bourdon Street Holland Street Manchester M40 7DB

The application site is located within the Miles Platting area of the City. The area has been identified as a key regeneration area within the Manchester Core Strategy and a Private Finance Initiative (PFI) has operated in this area since 2006. The PFI seeks to transform the area with the key objective of improving the supply of residential accommodation, particularly homes for sale, together with undertaking key improvements to infrastructure such as public parks and refurbishment of existing homes.

Neither the applicant or any objectors were present at the meeting.

Officers confirmed that the applicant had submitted revised plans in response to issues raised by Citywide Highway Support and the Canal and rivers trust that incorporate additional safety measure and enhancements to the scheme which are considered acceptable. As a result condition 2 has been revised to reflect these changes.

Officers also recognised the Committee's interest in tree replacement, and advised that 81 trees would be planted to mitigate the loss of trees at the development site, which would be a gain of 55 trees and this needs to be seen in the context of the wider PFI area where the applicant has planted a total of 626 trees which is a gain of 395 trees with 44 existing trees retained.

The Committee welcomed the commitment to the replacement tree planting, and welcomed the development overall.

The Committee questioned why the development was to be exempted from the 20% Affordable Housing policy, and officers confirmed that there is no policy requirement for affordable housing as the proposed development meets the exceptions within Council's adopted policy as there is a signed contract in place prior to December 2007 for development of this site.

In addition the Committee asked for clarification as to whether the proposed footpath closures would result in the development becoming in effect a gated community. Officers confirmed that access to the Canal would be retained, and that the approved layout was subject to appropriate conditions. Officers also confirmed that any request to gate this development would require planning permission in it's own right, and did not form part of these proposals.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the amended condition 2 as detailed in the Late Representation.

PH/19/5. 121721/FO/2018 - Land Bounded By Quay Street And Manchester College To The North, Gartside Street And New Quay Street To The East, Old Granada Studios To The South And The Victoria And Albert Marriot Hotel And Water Street To The West

The site is part of a larger area bounded by Quay Street, Manchester College, Gartside Street and the Victoria and Albert Marriott Hotel and most of its building have now been cleared. Planning permission was granted in December 2016 (Ref no. 109660) to demolish all existing buildings and structures, including Albert Shed and Globe and Simpson to enable the construction of four buildings comprising:

1. Building 1 would be 52 storeys and incorporate 180 hotel bedrooms on 12 floors and 287 apartments on 35 floors. It would include 1, 2 and 3 bed apartments, with some being duplex, and 4 penthouses.
2. Building 2 would be an 8 storey hotel.
3. Building 3 would be 18 storeys with 88 apartments ranging from 1 to 3 bedrooms.
4. Building 4 would provide 12 apartments over 4 floors ranging from 1 to 3 bedrooms.

This application seeks to replace building 2, with a 9 storey office building. Its height would increase by 8m to accommodate an additional floor and because the mechanical, electrical and ventilation requirements are greater for offices. The footprint of the office building would be more regular to provide efficient space and the remainder of the site would be developed out in accordance with the consented scheme.

The applicants agent spoke to the Committee and explained that the revised proposals relate to the operational requirements of a potential office tenant for Building 2, with a view to it becoming a hub of operations for any business looking to locate within Enterprise City in St Johns. The building has been designed to be fully occupied by a tenant and addresses their specific operational requirements.

St John's is intended to be a design, technology and creative hub, and accommodating this tenant would provide a significant number of jobs, training and development opportunities. In addition, robust testing has indicated that the proposal was consistent with regeneration priorities for St. John's. The proposal would bring the site back into a long-term, viable and active use. It would bring jobs to the area and support the construction sector.

The Committee asked for clarification of the heritage impact of the development, and officers confirmed that the Heritage Assessment related to the previous proposals, which included a 54 storey tower, which this new development would not.

The Committee concluded that the proposal is in accordance with, and positively contributes to, the aims of planning policy at national and local levels, including the National Planning Policy Framework and the adopted Manchester Core Strategy.

Decision

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

PH/19/6. 121014/FO/2018 & 121015/LO/2018 - 12 - 16 Piccadilly Manchester M1 3AN

The site measures 0.07 hectares and is bounded by Piccadilly, Gore Street and Chatham Street with the Waldorf Public House (Roby Street) and Indemnity House (no.7 Chatham St) immediately to the rear. It is occupied by the vacant Grade II Listed former Union Bank building at 12 Piccadilly and an adjacent surface level car park (14 -16 Piccadilly). It forms part of a wider island site bounded by Piccadilly, Gore Street, Roby Street and Chatham Street.

The Listed building was built in 1911 and designed by Thomas Worthington and Son. It is constructed of Portland Stone and has a rectangular plan form with a chamfered corner that articulates the main ground floor former bank entrance. The tripartite elevations have channelled rustications to the ground floor, rusticated quoins to all angles of the upper floors and pedimented attic windows articulate the roof. The door at the junction of Chatham Street and Piccadilly is not original and has been replaced. The round-headed doorway on Piccadilly does have its original doors which provided access into office spaces on the upper floors.

The applications propose the erection of a 23 storey building (121m), plus a plant level, and the conversion of the listed building to create a 356 bed hotel comprising 116 single, 44 twin, 175 double, 6 deluxe double rooms and 15 accessible rooms (11 in listed building and 4 in the new building). There would be bedrooms on the first, second, third and fourth floors of the refurbished Listed Building. The hotel entrance would be on Gore Street where a ground floor lobby would link via stairs and a lift to a breakfast area, within the former banking hall of the Listed Building. Ancillary facilities comprising offices, plant space, cycle parking and a laundry would be in the basement of the Listed Building.

The current proposal is an amendment to this most recently submitted scheme and would retain more of the internal fabric of the listed building including stairwell that would previously been removed. The height of the new build element has increased from 22 to 23 storeys as a consequence.

The applicant's agent spoke to the Committee and explained the scope and background to the proposed development. This would be the first UK hotel for this operator, who have recently opened a UK headquarters in Manchester. The proposals have also been designed to retain as much as possible of the internal structure and architecture of the Listed Building, which has been vacant since 2006. After discussion with Historic England, more of the internal fabric and structures will be retained than was planned under the previous permissions, both of which have

now expired. He said that Historic England have also described the current proposals as a significant improvement on the previous schemes.

The proposals will support a £90 million investment into the Manchester economy, and will support the creation of 175 jobs in the construction phase, and 58 permanent jobs when operational.

The Committee asked for clarification regarding the retention of heritage assets and the Green infrastructure, and requested clarification of whether planting 3 street trees was sufficient, given the level of pollution in the City Centre. The Committee also asked for further information as to whether the development would have a “Green Roof” as suggested in the report. The Committee also expressed some concern that the scale of the building would lead to overshadowing of neighbouring buildings, including the Listed Building.

Officers advised the Committee that due to the constraints of the site, 3 street trees appeared to be the maximum amount that could fit on the site frontages. Officers agreed that they would take this matter away and seek to negotiate an additional condition to explore the potential for further planting of street trees should this be possible, and reminded the Committee that the development should not contribute to pollution as it was intended to be car free.

Officers also confirmed that the Green Roof will be provided and is included as part of the plans submitted by the applicant.

With regard to overshadowing, officers advised the Committee that an assessment of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing has been undertaken, using specialist software to measure the amount of daylight and sunlight that is available to windows in a number of neighbouring buildings. The assessment made reference to the BRE Guide to Good Practice – Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight Second Edition BRE Guide (2011). The guidance does not have ‘set’ targets and is intended to be interpreted flexibly. It acknowledges that there is a need to take account of locational circumstances, such as a site being within a town or city centre where higher density development is expected and obstruction of natural light to buildings is sometimes inevitable.

The Committee asked for clarification as to the construction materials to be used, and whether they would merge with the materials of the Listed Building, and officers confirmed that while as much of a match as possible would be made, it was inevitable that there would be a visual difference between Portland Stone aggregate which the development would be constructed with, and 100 year old Portland Stone which the Listed Building was constructed from.

The Committee also asked if the 4% accessible rooms in the proposed Hotel was comparable to other hotels of this size, and expressed some concern that there was no disabled parking provision included in the proposal. Officers confirmed that there is no specific percentage figure that could be applied to this or any other development, but that the level of number of rooms was comparable with other hotels of this size. Officers added that 2 on-street disabled parking bays would be provided as part of the scheme.

The Committee concluded that the proposals would be consistent with a number of the GM Strategy's key growth priorities. There is an important link between economic growth, regeneration and the provision of new employment opportunities and there is an acknowledged need to provide additional hotel accommodation in the city centre in order to support the sustainable growth of the region's economy.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late Representations and the further condition regarding street trees.

PH/19/7. 121380/FO/2018 - Swan House Swan Street Manchester M4 5DF

This item was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the meeting, and will be considered at a later date.

PH/19/8. 121142/FO/2018 - Allen Hall 281 Wilmslow Road Manchester M14 6HT

This application relates to a broadly rectangular site of 0.58 hectares, bounded by Wilmslow Road to the west and Cromwell Range to the south. Across Wilmslow Road to the west is the Manchester High School for Girls campus, to the south across Cromwell Grove is the Hollins Building (the Toast Rack) currently being renovated. Abutting the site to the east and fronting Cromwell Grove is the side elevation of Weston Court a three storey building with accommodation in the roof providing two, three and four bedroom flats for students. To the north of the site is Thorne House, a private flat development separated from the application site by a private access road shared by Thorne House and the Allen Hall Site. Thorne House comprises 72 flats with access, both pedestrian and vehicular from the private road which is a cul de sac off Wilmslow Road.

Officers advised that there had been some minor alterations to the proposals that had resulted in changes to conditions 4 and 14, and a typographic error in condition 2. The revised conditions were included in the Late Representations. Officers also proposed an additional condition regarding cycle storage and the number of cycles that could be parked in the garage at the rear of the site.

The applicant's agent spoke to the Committee and explained the background to the proposals. He also explained that the proposals had been subject to detailed discussions with officers since the development was initially proposed. He added that the principle of using Allen hall as student accommodation was well established, and that the premises had been used for this purpose previously. This application was for a change of use of parts of the building to create additional, modern accommodation that would significantly improve the quality of the accommodation on offer.

The Committee asked for clarification as to the size of the rooms to be offered, and whether they would be smaller than currently on offer. The Committee also asked

about the proposed travel plan, and whether parking limitations could be put on the private road that is used to access the site.

Officers confirmed that the additional rooms would utilise the space available more effectively, including roof voids, than the current layout, which will easily allow the increased number of bedspaces. Officers also said that it would not be possible to put parking limitations on the private road.

The Committee asked for clarification as to whether there would be an on site Bar selling alcohol, and officers confirmed that the amenity space would not be a licensed premises and there was a condition that this must be ancillary to the accommodation only.

Officers also confirmed that the adjoining school had not made any representations regarding the proposals.

The Committee concluded that that those elements of the proposed development which require planning permission accord with the City Councils policies and that the development will bring back into use a series of vacant buildings which if left vacant will continue to detract from the visual and residential amenity of the area.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late Representations, and an additional condition regarding cycle storage and the number of cycles that could be parked in the garage at the rear of the site.

PH/19/9. 121302/FO/2018 - Alleyway Between 34 Whiteholme Avenue, 70 Merseybank Avenue And 17-19 And 21 Brandwood Avenue Manchester M21 7PH

This application relates to the footpath which runs north to south between Whiteholme Avenue and Brandwood Avenue on the Merseybank estate. The footpath is located adjacent to no.'s 32 and 34 Whiteholme Avenue and 70 Merseybank Avenue, running through adjacent to no.'s 17, 19 and 21 Brandwood Avenue. Permission is sought to install fencing to the pedestrian alleyway and change the use of the alleyway to form private gardens.

Decision

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

(Councillors Clay and Wilson declared prejudicial interests in this item and took no part in the decision and left the room while the decision was made)

PH/19/10. 120302/FO/2018 - Heald Green House, Irvin Drive, Manchester, M22 5LS

The site measuring 0.9 hectares is currently occupied by a two storey residential apartment block known as Heald Green House. Consent is sought for the creation of

a 743 space off-airport car park with access road off Styal Road, installation of 2.4m high weld mesh fencing and gates, 45 4.7m high galvanised steel lighting columns and office cabin with associated landscaping. The car park would be open 24 hours 7 days a week. 16 members of staff would be employed on site.

The application would involve the demolition of Heald Green House which currently accommodates 13 residential units.

The applicant's agent spoke to the Committee and said that the proposed car park would operate on a Park and Ride principle, with passengers being transported to the Airport by mini bus. He said that the principal of the proposed use had been well established, with several other Airport parking facilities in the vicinity. He also explained that the existing entrance to the site on Irvin Drive would be closed, and a new entrance from Styal Road created as part of the development. He added that there was an anticipated increase in demand for Airport parking, and that this development would provide a much needed facility.

The applicant's agent also advised the Committee that there would be comprehensive landscaping undertaken as part of the development, and emphasised the benefits of the creation of jobs and development opportunities.

Councillor Newman spoke in objection to the proposals. He conceded that applications for car parking on this site had been approved in the past, but that these had been for much smaller schemes. He added that past approvals were 13 and 15 years ago, and that it would not be reasonable to consider that these were still extant. Since those proposals were improved, there has been a considerable amount of residential development adjacent to the site, and that consideration of these residents and their amenity must be considered carefully. He added that some properties were just 11 metres away from the site of the proposed car park, and given that the proposals were for hours of operation 24 hours a day and 7 days a week, the associated vehicle movements, floodlights and noise would be unacceptable. He said that the demolition of Heald Green House and the loss of the associated accommodation was unacceptable when there was such a high demand for affordable accommodation across the City.

He said that none of the proposed mitigation measures or conditions were sufficient to address the loss of amenity to residents, and the associated noise, light and air pollution that would result if the development was approved, and questioned the assertion in the report that approval would be in the public interest.

The Committee expressed considerable concerns about the additional vehicle movements, noise and air pollution that would impact on the local community, particularly during the night time hours. The Committee also expressed significant concern about the loss of accommodation to be replaced by car parking, and were of the opinion that this scheme would represent an overdevelopment of car parking in this part of the City.

Officers told the Committee that they did have sympathy with the concerns raised, but that the application had to be considered on the basis of the previous permissions, the extant consent, on its own merits and according to local and

national policies. For this reason officers had concluded that the proposals should be approved. Officers added that the principle of the use in this case has already been approved, at issue is the increase in the number of cars capable of being parked, i.e. from 500 spaces to 743 spaces. On the basis of the scheme as amended to include appropriate landscaping and tree planting, subject to appropriate conditions, officers considered that on balance the proposal would be acceptable.

The Committee considered that concerns regarding the loss of residential amenity, loss of reasonably priced housing and associated vehicle movements, air and light pollution meant it should be supported at this time. The scheme would not make a positive contribution.

Decision

Minded to refuse due to the loss of residential amenity, loss of reasonably priced housing and associated vehicle movements, air and light pollution.

PH/19/11. 122025/FO/2018 - 17 Northen Grove Manchester M20 2NL

(Councillor N Ali in the Chair)

The application site is a 2-storey, 5-bedroom semi-detached, double-fronted Victorian house situated on the eastern side of Northen Grove in the Didsbury West ward. The property has accommodation over 4 floors including 3 large cellar chambers, living room, dining room, kitchen and utility room at ground floor, 3 bedrooms and a bathroom at first floor and 2 bedrooms with a further bathroom at second floor. There are modest sized gardens at the front and rear and a tarmac driveway along the northern side of the property. The property is bounded at the front by its original brick dwarf wall with stone copers and original gate posts, and both brick and timber panel fencing at the rear. Within the rear garden there are both an original brick outhouse and a brick garage.

The application proposes the change of use of a dwelling house (Class C3a) to a house in multiple occupation (Class C4). No elevational alterations are proposed; the application is accompanied by a copy of a letting advertisement (which advertises the property as 4-bedroom).

A local resident spoke in objection to the proposals, and said that the existing parking problems would be greatly exacerbated should the permission be granted. She explained that the road was so narrow, an ambulance that had been called to a resident had to park in the middle of the road, completely blocking the road. In addition, the current parking situation made the street dangerous for pedestrians, with pavements regularly blocked by both vehicles and bins, and an HMO would just make this worse.

Officers reminded the Committee that the application had been recommended for refusal, and reiterated the reasons for refusal that had been submitted.

Decision

To refuse the application for the following reasons.

1. The proposed change of use would lead to the loss of a family dwelling which would undermine the aim of achieving an appropriate balance of housing provision in the locality and the objective of achieving a sustainable and cohesive housing offer. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of policies H6, H11, SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy, the Guide to Development in Manchester SPD and to the Manchester Residential Quality Guidance document.
2. The proposed change of use of the property into a House in Multiple Occupation, would lead to an overly intensive use of the site which would be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring residents leading to increased levels of noise and activity from the general comings and goings which would be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers contrary to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy and saved UDP policy DC26.1.
3. The proposed change of use does not include sufficient arrangements for the parking of vehicles within the curtilage of the site and it is considered that the potential requirement for car parking generated by the proposed use would result in on-street parking in the locality which would exacerbate existing car parking difficulties and traffic congestion. This in turn would be detrimental to highway safety and the amenity of nearby residential occupiers, contrary to policies T2, SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

(Councillor Ellison declared a prejudicial interest in this item and took no part in the debate or the decision and left the room while the decision was made)