

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 17 December 2020

This Planning and Highways meeting was a hybrid meeting conducted in person and via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.

Present: Councillor Curley (Chair)

Councillors: Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Hitchen, Kamal, Leech, J Lovecy, Madeleine Monaghan, Riasat and White

Apologies: Councillor Flanagan, Lyons and Watson

Also present: Councillors:

PH/20/69. Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications (126912/FH/2020, 128191/FO/2020, 122280/FO/2019, 128018/FO/2020), since the agenda was issued.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/20/70. Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2020 as a correct record, subject to the inclusion of Councillor Leech in the list of those present.

PH/20/71. 126912/FH/2020 - 1C Ardern Road, Manchester, M8 4WN - Crumpsall Ward

This application relates to the erection of a two-storey side extension and a single storey rear extension together with the installation of a front dormer, including a roof light and a dormer to the rear, porch and canopy to form additional living accommodation.

The proposal includes at ground floor level the addition of a kitchen, hallway, WC and morning room. The first floor includes two bedrooms and a utility room and the roof space includes two bedrooms and a shower room.

The Planning Officer provided an update including drawing Members attention to the late representation report. The update related to the advice that if Members agree

with the recommendation then it will be necessary to revise the wording of condition 9 which relates to tree protection in order to ensure an appointed tree consultant supervises the excavation element and ensure that adequate protection is in place to ensure root protection. To also include an additional condition to require and agree proposed levels within the rear garden. The Planning Officer also reported that additional correspondence had been received from a planning consultant representing a neighbouring occupier which claims that the advice given to Committee by officers within the report in relation to the assessment and conclusions reached on the impact of the Conservation Area is deficient and may be seriously and materially misleading. Reference is made to Section 72 of the Planning, Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act, Paragraph 193 and Paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Planning Officer advised Members that the Planning Service was satisfied that the relevant guidance had been fully considered and taken into account in the assessment and recommendation made and is proportionate to the scheme proposed.

The Committee undertook a site visit to the site prior to the meeting.

The Chair invited the objector's spokesperson to address the committee.

The objector's spokesperson referred to points raised within the report and highlighted the negative impact the application would have the neighbouring property through the loss of amenity, the conservation area (history and character), street scene through the terracing effect of the design and impact on trees. The application did not provide a balanced design and the size of the development did not provide any public benefit with the loss of an affordable home. It was added that there was no necessity for a six bedroomed property.

The Planning Officer responded to the points raised and informed the Committee that the application had been substantially amended since it was first submitted. The concerns outlined had been addressed and met national standards regarding conservation areas and design. A gap was introduced to the design to prevent terracing effect and the investment being made to the property would benefit and enhance the area.

The applicant's representative was not present at the meeting.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to ask questions and comment of the application.

A member referred to the width of the path at the side of the property and asked if it is sufficiently wide enough for a wheelie bin. Also, with reference to the rear garden, officers were asked what level the area would be.

It was reported that the width of the path had been raised with the applicant and the drawing submitted shows the path width is sufficiently wide for a wheelie bin. In response to the level of the rear garden the Committee was informed that the plan submitted stated that the grassy knoll would be retained. The proposed recommendation is that discussions would take place with the applicant and planning officers on the level of the garden.

A member referred to the size of the rear extension and the potential impact on the adjacent property and asked officers to explain the guidance on allowing an extension over 3.65metres.

The Committee was informed that the decision to agree the extension over the 3.65metres was considered acceptable due to the proposed building having a flat roof and its orientation. It was explained that the national guidance allows for larger extensions over 4 metres, with prior approval.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation to approve the application, subject to an amendment to Condition 9 and an additional condition relating to the rear garden level. Councillor Hitchen seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted, the amendment of Condition 9 and an additional condition regarding the rear garden level.

(Councillor Monaghan did not take part in the vote on the application.)

PH/20/72. 128191/FO/2020 - Land Bounded by Ashton Canal, Great Ancoats Street, Munday Street and Pollard Street, Manchester, M4 7DS - Ancoats and Beswick Ward

This application is for the erection of five office buildings and new public realm comprising: 3 no. 8 storey mixed use buildings (Buildings A, D and E) comprising workspaces (Use Class E) together with flexible uses at ground floor (Use Class E) and/or theatre/bar (Sui Generis) together with a multi-use rooftop amenity area to Building A; and 2 no. 5 storey mixed use buildings (Buildings B and C) comprising workspaces (Use Class E) together with flexible uses at ground floor (Use Class E) and/or theatre/bar (Sui Generis); together with cycle parking, creation of pedestrian and cycle routes, external amenity spaces, new public realm and other associated engineering and infrastructure works.

The Planning Officer provided an update, as reported in the late representations received. The update related to the receipt of ten letters of support for the application and three letters of objection. The letters received in objection raised additional issues relating to loss of sunlight and daylight and reference to a newt located less than 500metres from the site. Ward Councillor (Councillor Majid Dar) had raised resident's concerns about the application and the impact it would have on the local community amenity and the belief that the proposal is very excessive and overindulgent. It was reported that HS2 had no objections to the scheme subject to the additional detailed conditions on the implementation of the scheme.

The Chair invited an objector to address the Committee. The objector made reference to the Council's Core Strategy (Spatial Principle 6) regarding the provision of green infrastructure and questioned the development on valuable green space which is used by the local community. It was suggested that more recognition of changes to working behaviour should be given, in view the increase in office space

and the ongoing increase in homebased working. Other issues were the lack of infrastructure for travel to the area and the number of objections received from local residents. Reference was made to the cost of the sale and purchase of the land involved in the proposal

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Taylor (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to voice the concerns of local residents and the other two ward councillors. The main concern related to the loss of space which is used by residents for leisure and recreation in an area with properties with little or no outdoor space. Concerns were raised that the loss of green spaces would have an adverse impact on the health and wellbeing of local people at a time when access to green spaces is very much valued. It was considered that the new green spaces proposed in the application are too small for the number of residents who currently use the existing space.

The Planning Officer reported that the Core Strategy should be considered as a whole and not as individual parts. The planning report submitted had addressed the Core Strategy and the relevant policies had been referred to. The green space identified for the proposal does not have any status and had been earmarked for development for many years. The proposal is consistent with a long-term vision for the area of New Islington and East Manchester. The Committee were informed that costs attributed to the sale or purchase of land is not a material planning issue and should not be considered. With reference to the proposed increase in office space it was reported that an economic recovery plan was in place and the increase in residential and office accommodation were integral to the plan. Discussions with a cross section of businesses within the city had indicated that there is a desire to return to work and there is a need for good quality office accommodation. The site is sustainable with a tram stop close by and the location also enables other form of transport to be used such as cycling. In addition, the proposal will provide large scale employment during the construction (1200) and afterwards.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and asked questions.

A member referred to the number of blocks involved in the proposal and the amount of green space proposed and considered this to be insufficient to replace what is currently there. Reference was also made to the New Islington Metrolink stop and whether any conditions included for the increase of green coverage.

The Planning Officer reported that a third of the proposed site would be used as green and open space and access will be opened onto the canal towpath. With reference to the Metrolink it was reported that HS2 may potentially result in changes to the Metrolink network and it would be anticipated that Metrolink would be encouraged to provide a suitable tram stop for a popular area, such as the tram stop located at Castlefield.

In welcoming the proposal, a member referred to the accessibility of the routes into and around the proposed buildings and the potential loss of light on green spaces and the current access road currently used by residents of adjacent buildings which may become congested.

The Planning Officer explained to the Committee that the development design must take into account elements of access, green space the proposed build and the integration with the surroundings and the residents living there. It was reported that the proposal combines different routes to allow access. With reference to light on open spaces it was reported that an assessment was made on the impact of the proposed buildings on the loss of day light and it was considered that the level of sunlight/ daylight would be adequate in those areas of green space. The proposal would mean that there will be eighty less parking spaces and this would reduce the number of cars and congestion. It was explained that light levels to the existing buildings is high due to the open nature of the space. The proposal will impact on the amenity of the residents of the adjacent buildings however, officers did not believe that this was unusual in this type of development elsewhere in the city centre.

A member asked officers why Condition 26 had been omitted and what other conditions would be expected as a result of HS2.

It was reported that Condition 26 had been removed at the request of Metrolink which had originally requested it to be added. The input of HS2 for specific conditions for the scheme were for the purpose of future proofing the site for potential changes to the Metrolink Network as a result of HS2 to enable co-ordination of both schemes.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation to approve the application.
Councillor Shaukat Ali seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted, the removal of Condition 26 and the addition of Conditions relating to arrangements for HS2 developments.

(Councillor Leech declared a prejudicial interest and took no part in the consideration of the application.)

PH/20/73. 122280/FO/2019 - Land Bounded by Great Ducie Street and Mirabel Street, Manchester, M3 1PJ - Deansgate Ward

This application relates to an application for the erection of new mixed-use development to comprise of one 10 storey building fronting Mirabel Street to accommodate 45 no. Use Class C3 residential apartments (9 no. 1-bed studios, 27 no. 2-bed 3 person apartments and 9 no. 2-bed 4 person apartments) and 8 no. residential car parking spaces at ground level and one part 10, part 14 storey building fronting Great Ducie Street to accommodate 84 no. Use Class C3 residential apartments (31 no. 1-bed 2 person apartments, 26 no. 2-bed 3 person apartments, 18 no. 2-bed 4 person apartments and 9 no. 3-bed 5 person apartments) and 345 sq. m of commercial floor space at ground level (flexible use Use Class A1 shop, Use Class A2 financial and professional services and Use Class A3 cafe/restaurant) together with creation of roof terrace amenity space, cycle parking, access, servicing and associated works following demolition of existing building

The Planning Officer provided an update, as reported in the late representations received. The report referred to representations received from ward Councillors to object to the development for the reasons that:

It is an overdevelopment;

The proposed building is too tall and fails to meet the requirements of Core Strategy Policy EN2;

The development would cause overlooking;

The development does not appropriately reflect the character of the area;

The proposal harms the setting of heritage assets;

The development would strain local roads;

The proposal would promote crime and anti-social behaviour;

The proposal does not address the existing and future deficiencies in physical, social and green infrastructure;

The proposal fails to meet Core Strategy Policy H8 and mixed communities (H1).

One further objection had been received.

The late representation report included amendments to the conditions and additional conditions.

The Chair invited the objector's spokesperson to address the Committee. The objector's spokesperson referred to the area of the proposal and suggested the Committee visit the site. Reference was also made to the listed building on Mirabel Street which had not received a response from Historic England. The objector spokesperson stated that the responses that had been received from the developer on the issues raised by objectors were considered misleading and the comparisons given cannot be relied upon. The design of the building using a blue grey colour material, was not considered to be in keeping with the surrounding area which are predominantly red brick and would be an eyesore. Concern was expressed on the narrow street which is in a state of poor repair and causes access issues for vehicles and may result in issues for emergency vehicle access. The area suffers from vehicles parking on the pavement and the number of vehicle journeys would increase as a result of the development. There are concerns on the lack of light already for buildings adjacent. A request was made that if agreed the undertakings proposed by the applicant are taken up.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Davies addressed the Committee to oppose the application as a Ward Councillor and then left the meeting for the consideration of the application.

The Planning Officer reported the in response to points raised: the roof terrace element of the proposal would be carefully controlled by a condition (Condition 14). The location of the bin store access gates provides to best access to the premises and the Condition will require this is managed properly. A further condition could be added to the address the issue of pavement parking by installing bollards. It was reported that the area of the development does not hold any heritage status, although there are listed buildings within the vicinity. The Committee was informed that this is a development site and is on a major access road into the city centre. The Committee has also previously agreed to a seventeen-storey building in this location.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

A member of the Committee referred to the previous 106 agreement made in 2007 and asked officers to provide more information. Officers were also asked to clarify the contribution to affordable housing, although no reason has been provided on why no affordable housing is being provided on site. Reference was made to a condition being added to introduce bollards and if this would increase access and egress from the area.

The Planning Officer reported that information would be provided on the details of the 106 agreement. The contribution for affordable housing is £615,000, as stated in the report. In response to the installation of bollards and the impact on access, the Committee was informed that accessibility or obstruction issues on the highway would be subject to enforcement action. The Committee was informed that the application had received an independent viability appraisal, that is publicly available, which had identified £615,000 allocation for affordable housing.

A member referred to the provision of electric vehicle charging points and asked officers if additional points were required in the development, in view of the phasing out of new diesel and petrol cars by 2030.

The Planning Officer referred to the sustainable location of the site which would reduce the need for vehicles and the need for resilience within the development to provide additional charging points for future use.

Councillor Leech proposed a Mind to Refuse the application based on the lack of affordable housing within the application and for the reason that the application is an over development. The proposal was not seconded.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation to be minded to approve, subject to an additional condition to address parking issues through the installation of pavement bollards to prevent pavement parking and improve vehicular access to the development. Councillor White seconded the proposal.

Decisions

The Committee is minded to approve the application, subject to a legal agreement in respect of a reconciliation payment of a financial contribution towards off-site affordable housing and subject to an additional condition to address parking issues through the installation of pavement bollards to prevent pavement parking on Mirabel Street.

(Councillor Davies declared a prejudicial interest and spoke as a ward Councillor and then left the meeting and took no part in the consideration of the application.)

PH/20/74. 126328/FO/2020 - Speakers House, 39 Deansgate, Manchester, M3 2BA - Deansgate Ward

This application relates to the erection of a 17 storey building comprising office use (Use Class B1a) and flexible ground floor commercial units (Use Classes A1 shop,

A2 financial and professional services, A3 restaurant/cafe and A4 drinking establishment), new electricity sub-station, basement cycle parking and rooftop plant enclosure, together with access, servicing and associated works following demolition of the existing building.

The Committee held a site visit at the proposed development site prior to the meeting.

The Planning Officer did not provide any additional information to the report submitted.

The Chair invited the objector's spokesperson to address the Committee.

The objector's spokesperson made reference to the concerns raised to the application regarding the height of the structure, overlooking on existing residential buildings adjacent to the proposed site, loss of light and opening hours.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Johns (ward councillor) Addressed the Committee and opposed the application.

The Planning Officer reported that the issues raised by objectors had been addressed within the planning report. The Committee was also informed that the building One Deansgate does not have special status and the impact of the proposed building on light and views would be no different to that of other new buildings within the city centre.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Members of the Committee referred to the impact of the development on the amenity of residents and heritage assets, conservation area, due to its location, height, scale and dominance of the area and indicated that they would not support the application.

Councillor White moved a proposal to Mind to Refuse the application the reasons stated. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Davies.

Decision

The Committee is Minded to Refuse the application for the reasons that the negative impact of the development on the amenity of residents, heritage assets, conservation area, due to its location, height, scale and dominance of the area.

(Councillor Shaukat Ali left the meeting room during consideration of the application and took no further part in the meeting.)

Councillor Nasrin Ali lost connection to the meeting during the consideration of the application and took no further part in the meeting.)

PH/20/75. 126308/FO/2020 - 2-4 Whitworth Street West, Manchester, M1 5WX - Deansgate Ward

This application relates to the demolition of 2 to 4 Whitworth Street West and the construction of a mixed-use building, comprising flexible units for retail, food and drink use at ground floor level with a hotel at upper storeys, together with associated landscaping, servicing, cycle parking and other associated works.

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

No objector attended the meeting.

Councillor Jeavons (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to oppose the application for the reasons that the purpose as a hotel and appearance of the proposed building, due to poor architecture, would not fit in with the surroundings and the development would result in the loss of two important, although not listed, heritage buildings and a rise in anti-social behaviour. The Committee was also reminded that there are residential dwellings to the rear of the proposed building that would suffer a loss of amenity.

The Planning Officer reported that a hotel would be appropriate for this area of the city centre. The existing buildings on the site are not listed. The proposed building being offered is a high quality modern design that has been amended that would fit in with the surrounding area.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

A member of Committee referred to the existing buildings, which although did not have architectural merit, do have historic merit and commented that the buildings in question could be demolished at any time.

A member referred to the number of street trees to be included in the development and whether additional trees could be included.

The Planning officer informed the Committee that Historic England had been approached regarding the listing of the buildings which was refused. With reference to street trees it was reported that agreement would be reached to ensure that the maximum number of street trees would be included in the development.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation to approve the application.
Councillor Y Dar seconded the proposal.

Decision

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

PH/20/76. 128002/FO/2020 - One City Road, 1 City Road East, Manchester, M15 4PN - Deansgate Ward

This is for a full Planning Application for demolition of existing structures on site, erection of one 11-storey plus basement office building (Use Class E) and one 14-storey plus basement office building with ground floor commercial unit (Use Class E), landscaping, highways works, and associated works.

The Planning Officer did not make any additional comment on the report submitted.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Jeavons (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to oppose the application. The Committee was informed that the objector to the application had left the meeting. Reference was made to the objections submitted regarding the development and the impact on over four hundred apartments. There would be overlooking and overdevelopment for the area and loss of mature trees as well as amenity, privacy, sunlight and daylight. The Committee was asked to reject the application or to defer consideration to undertake a site visit.

Councillor Davies referred to the issues raised and objections received and requested that in view of this it would be appropriate for the Committee to hold a site visit.

Councillor Davies made a proposal for a site visit and this was seconded by Councillor Hitchen.

Decision

To agree to defer consideration of the planning application to allow a site visit to be carried out by the members of the Committee.

PH/20/77. 128018/FO/2020 - Jessiefield, Spath Road, Manchester, M20 2TZ - Didsbury West Ward

This application relates to the erection of a part three, part four storey building to provide 34 retirement apartments with associated communal facilities, landscaping and car parking following the demolition of the existing dwelling.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Kilpatrick (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to object against the application.

Councillor Leech addressed the Committee as a ward Councillor to object against the application and then left the meeting.

Councillor Stanton (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to object against the application.

The objections received related to overdevelopment, detrimental impact on the character of the area, impact on highways and road safety, impact on residential amenity including overbearing, overlooking, loss of privacy and increase in noise disturbance; loss of green space, trees and associated impacts on ecology including bats.

The Planning Officer reported that there were 26 parking spaces included in the proposal to serve the 34 units. The location of the development is within walking distance of transport links and is in a sustainable area.

Members commented that the proposed application is excessive and would be an over development of the site and for that reason should be refused.

Councillor Hitchen proposed that the Committee refuse the application for the reason that the application would be an over development. Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee refuse the application, for the reasons set out in the report submitted.

(Councillor Leech declared a prejudicial interest and spoke as a ward Councillor and then left the meeting and took no part in the consideration of the application.)