

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 1 July 2021**

**Present:** Councillor Curley (Chair)

**Councillors:** Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Hutchinson, Kamal, Lyons, Riasat, Richards and Stogia

**Apologies:** Councillor Baker-Smith, Kirkpatrick and J Lovecy

**Also present:** Councillors: Jeavons, Rawson, Shilton-Godwin and Wheeler

#### **PH/20/37. Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations received in respect of applications 130166/FH/2021, 121252/FO/2018 and 129010/FO/2020 since the agenda was issued had been circulated in advance of the meeting.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/20/38. Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 3 June 2021 as a correct record.

#### **PH/20/39. Application for 130166/FH/2021 - 11 Mardale Avenue Manchester Item No M20 4TU - Didsbury East Ward**

This application is for the erection of a part single, part two-storey side and part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension, the installation of rear dormer, front porch extension and elevational alterations to provide additional living accommodation. The property is not listed or in a conservation area and is typical of the type and style of properties within the immediate area. This application is a resubmission following an earlier refusal for a scheme consisting of larger extensions. The proposed extensions have been amended since the previous submission to reduce their scale and to reduce impacts on the appearance of the main part of the building and the neighbouring properties.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee on the application stating that the scheme had been revised and reduced in width with the roof height lowered and stated that the application was now acceptable.

The Committee was informed that there was no one present to speak in objection to the application.

The applicant was not present to address the Committee on the application.

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

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation for the Committee to Approve the application. Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee agreed the application as detailed in the report submitted and subject to the conditions included.

(Councillor Davies was not present in the meeting room and took no part in the consideration or vote on the application.)

### **PH/20/40. Application for 127241/FO/2020 - 515 To 521 Barlow Moor Road Manchester M21 8AQ - Chorlton Park Ward**

The application relates to a change of use of 515 Barlow Moor Road from ground floor retail (Use Class A1) and 1no. self-contained flat to form a single 2no. bedroom dwellinghouse (Use Class C3), elevational alterations to front and rear, landscaping, and, conversion of no.s 517 to 521 Barlow Moor Road from ground floor retail (Use Class A1) and 6no. self-contained flats to form 11.no self-contained flats (Use Class C3) together with a three storey rear extension to no.s 517 and 519 Barlow Moor Road, 3no front dormers and 3no. rear dormers, associated elevation alterations to front and rear including creation of vehicular and pedestrian access, bicycle and bin stores and formation of 6 no. car parking spaces

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee on the application, stating that the Committee had been on a site visit that morning, prior to the meeting.

A resident made representations on behalf of residents of the building and addressed the Committee in objection to the application on the grounds that there was insufficient space for all features proposed, that the garden to the rear is a wildlife corridor, that there were concerns over the potential for adding further car parking spaces and that the current tenants would be forced to move out of their homes when the development was complete.

Councillors Rawson and Shilton-Godwin (Chorlton Park Ward) addressed the Committee in objection to the application and requested that the application be refused for the reasons outlined.

The Planning Officer reported that the concerns over car parking and the garden space had been properly assessed and no objection was raised by the ecology unit and that the agent for the applicant had confirmed that current tenants would be supported with a move from the building to alternative accommodation.

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

A member of the Committee, referring to the report, noted that the current tenants had been given a year and a half to prepare to move out of the premises.

The Planning Officer stated that the Government standard advice was that a planning permission should commence within three years of the grant of permission.

The Director of Planning confirmed the Planning Officer's comments and stated that an extension could be sought if this was seen to be agreeable to the Committee.

A member of the Committee suggested the planning permission should be extended to five years and this would give the tenants a further period of time to make any arrangements to move to new accommodation.

The Director of Planning stated that this proposal could be added as a condition.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation of Approve for the application, subject to the added condition that the planning permission should be commenced within 5 years, so as to give the existing tenants further time within which to secure new accommodation. Councillor Richards seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee agreed the application as detailed in the report submitted and subject to the condition that the planning permission should be commenced within 5 years.

### **PH/20/41. Application for 121252/FO/2018 - Great Marlborough Street Car Park, Great Marlborough Street, Manchester M1 5NJ - Deansgate Ward**

The application relates to a partial reconfiguration of a Multi-Storey Car Park (MSCP), including temporary access off Great Marlborough Street, construction of 5 storey external ramps, closure of vehicular access to top level; and construction of new facade; and partial demolition of the surplus part of existing MSCP and erection of a part 55, part 11 storey, part 4 storey mixed-use building comprising 853 Purpose Built Student Accommodation units (sui generis), ancillary amenity space and support facilities, and 786sqm (GIA) SME incubator workspace (Use Class B1), including public realm improvements and other associated work.

The Planning Officer stated that there had been late representations which had been circulated to the Committee. A lengthy representation had been received on the morning of the committee which, it is understood, had been sent direct to all members of the Committee. The officer informed the Committee that the comments had not raised new issues and these had been fully set out and addressed in the printed report and the late representation. The officer responded to the comments about the Equalities Act and the Public Sector Equality Duty. These had been looked at and that officers are satisfied that the issues are adequately covered in the application and the report.

The officer also confirmed that the publishing of the report before the expiry of the (fourth) neighbour notification was in accordance with usual practice and there had been no failure to comply with due process or normal practice.

A local resident, acting as spokesperson for a resident's group, addressed the Committee in objection to the application on the grounds of the size of the development and associated carbon, waste and oxygen issues, loss of parking spaces during development, decrease in disabled parking spaces, increase to the traffic network in the immediate surrounding area and loss of amenity to neighbouring residences.

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

Councillor Jeavons (Deansgate Ward) addressed the Committee to object to the application.

The Planning Officer referred the Committee to the report, stating that all issues raised had been addressed. The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions and comment on the application.

A member of the Committee raised a question about the development's link with Manchester University and the percentage of units being affordable

The Planning Officer stated that the policy required the support of one University only, adding that Manchester Metropolitan University had provided this support and that there is no policy on providing affordable student accommodation.

A member of the Committee supported the principle of housing students and releasing HMOs back into the rental market for families but felt that the proposal was too tall at 55 storeys, feeling that 30 storeys would be more acceptable.

The Planning Officer stated that Executive had supported the provision of student accommodation in line with the Committee member's previous comments and added that the impact of buildings, once over a certain height, diminishes.

A member of the Committee raised the issue of parking for residents during and after the construction.

The Planning Officer stated that the parking spaces would be available throughout construction, other than when specific aspects of the building work were taking place.

A member of the Committee raised the issue of early publication of reports and concerns around taxis and food deliveries creating noise and disturbance in the vicinity.

The Planning Officer stated that, in this most recent round of consultation, local residents had been given 30 days to respond with comments. Some comments had been received following that round of notification. The latest comment was received on the morning of the meeting (day 37) and had been circulated to the Committee

Members. Addressing the other concerns, The Planning Officer stated that there is a robust management plan for the building with regard to taxis and deliveries.

Councillor Lyons moved that the Committee refuse the application on the grounds of excessive height, loss of amenity to local residents, lack of support from Universities and the impact of adding 853 students to a local community. Councillor Hutchinson seconded the proposal.

The Committee voted against Councillor Lyons' proposal.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve for the application, subject to a legal agreement. Councillor Hutchinson seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application as detailed in the report submitted, subject to the signing of a legal agreement in relation to infrastructure improvements.

(The Committee adjourned at this point for 10 minutes.)

### **PH/20/42. Application for 130475/LO/2021 - 42, 44 And 46 Thomas Street (Including 41, 43 And 45 Back Turner Street) Thomas Street, Manchester M4 1ER - Piccadilly Ward**

The planning application proposes the demolition of the Grade II Listed former Weavers Cottages 42-46 Thomas Street that were listed in 2018 following the grant of planning permission for their demolition in 2017. Approval of this proposal would enable the delivery of the wider site proposal including the retention and refurbishment of 7 Kelvin Street.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee a representation had been received from a local business stating that the proposal would be a benefit to the Northern Quarter.

A member of the Committee requested a deferral of this item until the Committee's previous decision to refuse an earlier application had been assessed by the Secretary of State.

The Director of Planning stated that this was a new application, albeit for the same proposal, and should be considered by the Committee and allow for officers to respond to any matters the committee may wish to raise before reaching a decision.

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

Councillor Wheeler (Piccadilly Ward) addressed the Committee in objection to the application and requested that the application be refused due to the loss of a historic working-class site.

Councillor Lyons (having declared an interest and speaking as Councillor for Piccadilly Ward) addressed the Committee in objection to the application and requested that the application be refused in line with Historic England's opposition to the demolition of the site.

(Councillor Lyons left the meeting for the remainder of this item and the following item).

The Planning Officer stated that there had been one earlier refusal of permission, not two as had been suggested by previous speakers. This was the second application for Listed Building Consent for these proposals. The Planning Officer advised that the current derelict site has a negative impact on the surrounding area. If the Committee made a decision to approve this application, it would need to be referred to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government who could decide to either call in the application for determination or refer it back to the City Council to issue a decision. This is different to an Appeal which are mutually exclusive processes.

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

Councillor Hutchinson moved to defer the application for a site visit. Councillor Davies seconded the proposal.

Councillor Stogia said that the site, which was known by many, is in a poor state and that a decision should not be delayed. Adding that that the redevelopment would support businesses which was much needed as a result of COVID-19 and proposed the application should be Approved, in line with the Officer recommendation. The Chair stated that the proposed deferral for a site visit would require a vote by the Committee.

The Committee voted against the deferral for a site visit.

Councillor Stogia moved the recommendation of Minded to Approve for the application. Councillor Shaukat Ali seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application, subject to referral to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, in accordance with the Arrangements for handling heritage applications – notification to Historic England and National Amenity Societies and the Secretary of State (England) Direction 2015.

### **PH/20/43. Application for 129010/FO/2020 - Public Car Park Accessed Via Stockport Road And Albert Road, Manchester M19 3AB - Levenshulme Ward**

The application relates to the temporary use of the southern half of public car park for a 4 year period in connection with the operation of a weekly market on Saturdays (10.00 am-4.00 pm) between March and December (inclusive) and no more than 10

annual Friday night-markets (5.00 pm-9.00pm) during the same period, retention of existing storage container unit and internal generator, reconfiguration of waste / recycling storage area and installation of electric power supply cabinet (following the phased decommissioning of an existing generator)

The Planning Officer stated that the frequency of the markets operations had been proposed to be increased in frequency but the application had been revised in order to seek approval for the same times and dates that the market had operated for the last four years.

There was no objector present at the meeting.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation for the Committee to Approve the application. Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee agreed the application as detailed in the report submitted and subject to the conditions included.