

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 14 March 2019**

**Present:** Councillor Ellison (Chair)

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

**Apologies:** Councillor Shaukat Ali and Madeleine Monaghan

**Also present:** Councillors: A Simcock and Wright

#### **PH/19/21. Supplementary Information on Planning Applications on this agenda.**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/19/22. Minutes**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 14 February 2019 as a correct record.

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 14 February 2019 as a correct record.

#### **PH/19/23. 121941/FO/2018 - 6 Meade Grove Manchester M13 0SG**

The application site relates to a two storey mid-terraced residential property (Class C3) in a predominantly residential area, with all the properties on the street appearing to be in use as Class C3 dwellinghouses. The property includes a small front private area and a medium sized rear garden area and is of an appearance that is uniform with surrounding properties.

Officers advised the Committee that the applicant had made further representation to address the concerns raised by residents, as summarised in the report. The applicant had stated:-

*“They recognise and acknowledge the concerns arisen by the immediate neighbours to the property. They are more than happy to address these concerns. They are confident that offering neighbours a greater understanding of their plans and future prospects will resolve any worries that neighbours may have and make them secure and safe.”*

The Committee asked for clarification regarding the staff to resident ratio, and were told that the intention was to have 4 residents, supported by 3 staff on a 24 hour basis.

The Committee were satisfied that concerns of residents were noted, but it is considered that these were largely based on perceptions of what might occur in a worst case scenario, rather than on actual experiences. The Committee considered that a use of this nature is most appropriately located in a residential area, as this provides the best setting to enable the residents of the premises, to integrate into society. The Committee were satisfied that the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representation would be sufficient to mitigate against and loss of amenity to residents.

## **Decision**

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

### **PH/19/24. 121809/JO/2018 - 51 Blossom Street Manchester M4 6AJ**

The application site relates to a part 8 storey, part 5 storey mixed use building known as 'Smiths Yard' that was granted planning permission in 2016 under planning permission reference 111742/FO/2016/N1. The building consists of 99 residential units and 4 ground floor commercial units which were granted permission for use classes A1 (retail) A2 (professional/financial services) A3 (restaurant/café) B1 (business) and D1 (non-residential institutions) with association car parking, landscaping, amenity space, vehicular access from Bengal Street and other associated works. The units are not yet occupied however are expected to be occupied by a variety of businesses within the permitted use classes.

The submitted application seeks to vary condition 21 attached to planning permission 111742/FO/2016/N1.

Condition 21 states

*The commercial units hereby approved, as indicated on drawing 1823-FCBS-A-2000 stamped as received by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, on the 31 March 2016, shall not be open outside the following hours:-*

*Monday to Saturday            08.00hrs - 23.00hrs  
Sundays                        09.00hrs - 23.00hrs*

*There shall be no amplified sound or any amplified music at any time within the units.*

*Reason - In interests of residential amenity in order to reduce noise and general disturbance in accordance with saved policy DC26 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.*

The application seeks to vary the operating hours of the commercial units as follows:

*Sunday to Thursday            08.00hrs - 23.30hrs*

Friday and Saturday 09.00hrs - 00.30hrs

The Committee concluded that a variation of condition 21 would not impact unreasonably on the residential amenity of those occupying the properties in the vicinity.

## **Decision**

To approve the application to vary condition 21 as follows.

*The commercial units hereby approved, as indicated on drawing 1823-FCBS-A-2000 stamped as received by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, on the 31 March 2016, shall not be open outside the following hours:-*

Sunday to Thursday 08.00hrs - 23.30hrs  
Friday and Saturday 09.00hrs - 00.30hrs

*There shall be no amplified sound or any amplified music at any time within the units.*

*Reason - In interests of residential amenity in order to reduce noise and general disturbance in accordance with saved policy DC26 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.*

### **PH/19/25. 120893/FO/2018 - Land Bounded By Bengal Street, Primrose Street, Radium Street And Silk Street Manchester M4 6AQ.**

The Committee undertook a site visit in the morning before the meeting started.

The site is in the Ancoats Conservation Area and the Ancoats and New Islington Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF). The delivery of new homes is a key objective in the regeneration of Ancoats to support its vitality and support economic and population growth. The site is within the City Centre and Regional Centre for planning and regeneration purposes.

Councillor Taylor, a local ward member had made a late representation in support of the development. Officers advised that she had said:-

*“The number of small and medium sized businesses in Manchester is growing at an incredible rate and space like this is in demand and welcomes Ancoats and New Islington becoming a hub for these types of businesses.”*

Officers also confirmed that she was supportive of the provision of family accommodation at this location, given the area had much to offer families.

The applicant was present and spoke to the Committee in support of the proposals. He said that they have a similar development, Jactin House, which has co-working space and serviced offices which start from 14 sqm to 279 sqm. It offers affordable and all-inclusive spaces to SMEs who wish to start and grow their business in Ancoats in a modern, well designed and professionally operated setting.

Occupiers would be able to choose from day passes, a monthly arrangement comprising either a floating or fixed desk, or a private office. There would be bookable meeting rooms. Space can be increased/decreased on a monthly basis. Regular networking events and workshops encourage tenants to collaborate.

This development would operate in a similar way and provide a mixed use scheme that would support the economic growth of Ancoats and deliver a key aspiration of the NDF.

He also explained that they had held property interests in the Ancoats area since the 1990's, and had several mixed use schemes in the area, which they had retained for management and maintenance purposes, delivered by a dedicated team based in Ancoats. He also explained that he believed that if they produced an excellent product, customers would be retained. He added that they take a proactive solution based approach to developments, rather than "churning out" developments that were all the same.

The applicant said that he has a long history of living and working in Ancoats, and is committed to providing high quality developments that he himself would be proud to live in. He explained that they had consulted with local residents and businesses, and that as a result the scheme had been reduced in height and scale. In addition, the scheme would provide family style accommodation, not just 3 bedroom accommodation, but specifically designed with family living in mind.

He also said that the strong setback at the top of the building would allow for outside family space on the roof terrace, to complement existing residential amenity. The development of the site would also create improvements to the street scene.

The Committee asked for clarification as to how the scale of the development would relate to the surrounding area, given the concerns raised by Historic England about the impact on the conservation area. Officers told the Committee that the remit of Historic England was very narrow, and they did not consider the broader range of issues that were the responsibility of the Committee to determine. Officers said that the site had always been earmarked for a taller building, and that the character of Ancoats had always been one of mixed use and mixed height buildings. Officers also said that the development would bring a currently derelict site back into productive use.

The Committee also expressed disappointment that the scheme would not provide any affordable housing, and asked whether there was a possibility that the 15 year review clause would provide some income or a contribution to affordable housing in the future. They also queried why there was a discrepancy between the independent viability report and the Council's testing of viability. Officers advised that there were 2 triggers to the review process, the first being that if the development did not commence within 2 years, there would be a review at that stage to determine whether market conditions had changed to allow for some affordable provision. The other trigger mechanism was because this proposal is for build to rent properties, if at some point the developer decides to put any properties up for market sale, within a 15 year period, this would also mean that the profitability of the scheme would be reassessed to determine whether there was any scope for a contribution to

affordability. Officers also confirmed that this was embedded in the S106 agreement, so although the precise details are not in the report, they are fully covered in the S106 agreement that has been reached.

With regard to the discrepancy in the profitability assessment, this is assessed independently, so no explanation for the discrepancy could be offered.

Officers also confirmed that as the proposals related to back-to-pavement development, there would be some street tree planting, but that this would be dependent on what was found once exploratory trenches were laid. Officers confirmed that the developer was committed to maximise the level of street tree planting.

The Committee also asked for clarification as to whether any conditions could address the issue of short term lets, and officers confirmed that this was contained in the development plan, as it was to the benefit of the developer to have longer term stable lets rather than short term lets.

## **Decision**

MINDED TO APPROVE subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement which retains the development as a PRS scheme for a covenant period together with a review mechanism at a future date.

### **PH/19/26. 122183/VO/2018 & 122184/LO/2018 - Manchester Central Convention Complex Windmill Street Manchester M2 3GX.**

The applications relate to the forecourt of Manchester Central. The Complex, consists of three main buildings: the former Central Station (Grade II\* Listed); the Manchester International Convention Centre (MICC); and the Seminar Centre. There are landscaped forecourts at the upper and lower level, the lower one being the former station approach which fronts onto Windmill Street. The complex is bounded by Watson Street/ the Great Northern Tower residential building, Windmill Street, Great Bridgewater Street and Lower Mosley Street. Surrounding the site are the Bridgewater Hall and the Grade II\* Listed Great Northern Warehouse, Radisson Edwardian Hotel and Midland Hotel. The complex is raised above street level and is separated from Lower Mosley Street by the Metrolink viaduct.

Planning permission and listed building consent is sought to erect a stone built circular memorial structure to commemorate the Peterloo Massacre on the north east part of the forecourt. Turner Prize winning architect, Jeremy Deller, has been working in collaboration with Manchester City Council and the Peterloo Memorial Campaign Group on the design which would comprise of two sets of concentric circles. One would rise in a series of steps to a central circular top and the other would be a version of this that is flush with the surrounding paving.

In the centre of both circles would be text in a compass-like configuration referring to analogous events that have occurred in the last 100 years. The circular form is intended to act as a compass, locating places in Manchester and the wider world.

Concerns have been raised about access to the memorial, especially by people with disabilities and wheelchair users. The applicant had undertaken a revision of the scheme that would allow for greater, but not full, access for people unable to climb to the top of the memorial. Officers confirmed that this was a modest adjustment, but would deliver a significant material outcome.

A representative of the objectors spoke to the Committee and said that they supported the idea of a memorial but that it needed to be in the right form. She pointed out that many of the people who survived with injuries after the Peterloo Massacre had been left with what would today be seen as significant disabilities, and that the memorial should take this into full account. She said that Peterloo had been an event of international significance, and that a memorial should be fully inclusive and not discriminatory. However, she did confirm that they had met with the applicant and that the concerns raised had been listened to and fully considered. She added that the applicant had shown a commitment to making the memorial as accessible as possible, and the redesign would make this as participatory as possible. She added that conditions should be in place to make this scheme a fit and proper memorial.

The applicant spoke to the Committee and said that the design of the memorial was intended to be as inclusive as possible, and was intended to be an assembly point and an interactive structure. He said that there was clearly an issue about access to the memorial, and he was profoundly affected by the issues raised, and that the redesign was intended to make the structure more accessible. He admitted that the design is not perfect, but that at this late stage it would be impossible to completely re-think the structure in time for the 200 year anniversary in August 2019.

Officers confirmed that it has proved difficult to find a suitable site for the memorial given the built up nature of the immediate area. The remodelling of the forecourt of Manchester Central had allowed for an area to be made available for the monument, within sight of the original location of St Peter's Field, the site of the Massacre. The area available is tightly constrained, and full access for people with limited mobility would not be possible given the limitations of the site.

The Committee welcomed the proposals, and agreed that this was a very important event, not just for the people of Manchester but internationally. They also welcomed the way that the design had been modified to allow for as full access as possible. The Committee noted the comment by Manchester Historic Buildings and Conservation Areas Panel, who questioned whether the memorial should be more figurative, but concluded that while a figurative memorial would be acceptable, the current design proposals accorded with all relevant Core Strategy policies.

The Committee also asked that display boards be placed close to the memorial to explain to visitors the significance and importance of Peterloo both locally and nationally. This will be an excellent educational opportunity, and officers confirmed that the educational potential of the memorial in relation to the events of 16 August 1819 would be maximised. The Committee also noted the contribution of the Peterloo Memorial Campaign and thanked them for the work that they had done to ensure that the list of those killed was as accurate as possible.

Officers confirmed that display boards would be provided, and while this was not part of this application, the intention was that the educational opportunity would be maximised. Officers also emphasised that while access to the monument would be provided, there would not be the possibility of full access at this stage, but that access would be as good as it could possibly be.

### **Decision**

The approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representation.

### **PH/19/27. 121857/FO/2018 - 84 Cambridge Street Manchester M15 6BP.**

The Committee received a request for a site visit. The Committee considered that a site visit was appropriate, as they concluded that the report did not provide sufficient information about the scale and setting of the proposed development in relation to surrounding residential properties.

### **Decision**

To defer the matter for a site visit.

### **PH/19/28. 121011/FO/2018 - Garages Rear Of 88 School Lane Manchester M20 6GH**

88 School Lane is a commercial property located at the junction of School Lane and Ladysmith Road. The property is currently vacant and the site has been secured with hoardings. The applicant is proposing to erect a part two/part three storey terrace of four dwellings at the corner of School Lane and which extends down the Ladysmith Road frontage. The properties will be three bed dwellings, two of which will have off-street parking provision for two cars each. The remaining two dwellings will have no off-street parking facilities.

A local resident spoke in objection to the proposals and said that while the site does need to be developed as it was currently derelict, but that the problems related to parking in the area were of concern.

Officers said that since the application had first been submitted, 4 of the proposed houses had been reduced in size from 3 to 2 storeys as a result of concerns raised by residents that the scheme would be too overbearing.

The Committee asked for clarification as to whether the properties in the proposed development would be restricted to not being used as HMO's, as this was a problem in the area, and officers confirmed that Condition 11 in the report fully addressed this issue.

The Committee also expressed concern that 2 of the properties would have no provision for off street parking, and queried whether this meant that the site would represent an overdevelopment. Members of the Committee who were familiar with the area commented that it was inconceivable that residents would not have a car,

and having to park on the street would increase pressure of what was an existing significant problem. Officers told the Committee that the current commercial nature of the site, a significant amount of car parking could be generated already. In addition, the loss of a story meant the facility to provide parking to all the properties had been lost.

The Committee concluded that the existing parking problems in the vicinity of the site combined with the proposal that 2 of the properties would not be provided with off-street parking was unacceptable, and found themselves minded to refuse the application as a result.

## **Decision**

Minded to refuse the application due to concerns about the impact of additional on street parking due to the lack of provision of parking for 2 properties in the development.

### **PH/19/29. 119951/FO/2018 - 10 Whitechapel Street Manchester M20 6UB**

10 Whitechapel Street is a two storey end-terraced property located on the edge of Didsbury District Centre. The property was formerly used as a sandwich shop but is now fully operational as a café (Class A3). Whitechapel Street runs from Wilmslow Road to Churchwood Road and consists predominantly of residential properties, namely two storey terraced dwellings and a larger 3 storey apartment complex. To the east of the property there is a car park that serves the commercial properties on Wilmslow Road. Immediately adjoining it there is a dwellinghouse (no. 12 Whitechapel Road). Opposite the site there is a turning head. Whitechapel Street is bollarded off approximately a quarter of the way along from the Wilmslow Road end, immediately to the east of the application property. This allows access to the rear of the commercial properties on Wilmslow Road and prevents rat-running along Whitechapel Road.

The applicant is using the basement and ground floor of the property as a café, with the basement being used to prepare the food and the ground floor housing the counter and seating areas. The applicant is also proposing to create a 2 bed self-contained flat on the first floor and in the roof space. Previously the first floor and roof space had been used as kitchens and ancillary accommodation (office and storage) for the previous sandwich shop use.

Officers drew the Committee's attention to the amended condition 3 as set out in the late representation.



The Committee concluded that the property does have a history of commercial use since the original planning permission in 1986 (025690 - alterations to form a retail shop on ground floor and self-contained flat at first floor) and its continued use adds to the district centre offer. .

It is considered that with restrictive conditions, e.g. hours of operation and fume/odour extraction and impact upon existing residents can be managed and kept to a minimum.

### **Decision**

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representation, in particular the amended wording of condition 3.