

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 14 December 2023

Present: Councillor Lyons (Chair)

Councillors: Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Curley, Davies, Gartside, Hassan, Hewitson, Hughes, Johnson, Kamal, J Lovecy and Riasat

Apologies: Councillor Chohan

Also present: Councillors: Abdullatif, Doswell, Hilal, Ilyas, Moran and Muse

PH/24/86. Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 137399/FO/2023, 137401/FO/2023, 138126/OO/2023, 137537/FO/2023, 138127/OO/2023 and 138128/OO/2023.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/24/87. Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 19 October 2023 as a correct record.

PH/24/88. 137399/FO/2023 - Land bounded by Upper Brook Street, Cottenham Street and Kincardine Road, Manchester, M13 9TD - Ardwick Ward & 137401/FO/2023 - Land between Upper Brook Street, Kincardine Road and Grosvenor Street Manchester - Ardwick Ward

The Committee considered the reports of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding:

137399/FO/2023 - the erection of a 6 to 9 storey building for Sci-Tech use (Use Class E (g)(ii)) and 265sqm of a cafe/bar (Use Class E (b)), and a 9 to 23 storey building for Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) (Use Sui Generis), comprising 737 bedrooms and 293sqm of community use (Use Class F2 (b)) and 80sqm of commercial floorspace (Use Class E), alongside new public realm, access, parking, and associated works following demolition of existing buildings.

114 objections (from 78 households) had been received. Councillors Muse and Abdullatif object.

And:

137401/FO/2023 - Full planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of three 12/14/29 storey buildings to be used for Purpose Built Student Accommodation (Use Sui Generis), comprising 983 bedrooms in total and 506sqm of ground floor ancillary uses (café/commercial and convenience store - Use Classes E (a)/(b)/(c)), three buildings comprising 5/7/9 storeys for Science and Innovation uses (Use Class E (g)(i) & (ii)) and 834sqm ground floor community uses (retail/ cafés and medical facility (Use Classes E (a)/(b) and (e)), and the provision of new public realm, two new public squares, new access and parking, and associated works.

Manchester Metropolitan University supported the proposal.

113 (from 76 households) objections were received during the first round of notification, 97 (from 77 households) had been received. Councillors Muse and Abdullatif object.

The Planning Officer stated that they recommended additional conditions regarding a student wellbeing strategy. The Planning Officer drew attention to matters in the late representations report regarding 6 additional objections for item 6 - 137401/FO/2023 - Land between Upper Brook Street, Kincardine Road and Grosvenor Street Manchester - Ardwick Ward. The Planning Officer stated that all points raised in those late representations were addressed within the report.

An objector attended the hearing and addressed the Committee, stating that it was not the job of the Brunswick community to solve the problems faced by students with a longer commuting distance. This was an unsustainable application as there was already PBSA in the area which stretched the resources. Adding this development would have a further negative effect on the community. Air pollution would be affected and the Medlock area already had the highest record in Manchester. There were also biodiversity issues to consider. Children in the area have a right to cleaner air and a cleaner urban environment. This proposal would see people using residential car parking spaces. Claiming that there would be zero additional cars was not realistic. This development would tower over the residents and block their light. There were 2 public consultations and the objector had attended. There were no buildings of similar height and massing in the area. 5,000 extra people and associated deliveries and taxis etc. was considered as a contempt for the community. The residents of this area wanted an affordable supermarket and affordable housing. As a resident of the area for the last 10 years, there had already been lots of building work endured which had a negative effect on residents. This was an attack on working class people.

Two applicant agents attended and spoke for each of the two applications, the first stating that the developers were proud of the work they had already undertaken in Manchester. They employed great design management and had consulted with and listened to the community as well as planning officers. There was a demand for student accommodation in Manchester. The developers understood the concerns of the local residents and had reduced the size of the scheme accordingly. This was an experienced operator who had given consideration to the mental health of students who would be based there. The scheme would create 5,000 construction jobs and

there was a growing demand for professionals that would be served by this application being granted. There would be a local, affordable store, medical centre, 3 acres of public realm and sports facilities as part of the development for the use of local residents.

The second agent stated that they represented a leading developer. This application would bring people together and create a university setting to compete with London, Oxford and Cambridge. This would create a dedicated property which would connect for tailored support to tenants. 1,500 new jobs would be created once completed. There would be a research and development science centre which would link with school and create skilled jobs. This development would deliver growth and prosperity to Manchester.

Ward Councillor Abdullatif addressed the Committee and stated that she had a great number of conversations with local residents about this application and none of them were in support of this development. She was in attendance with Ward Councillor Muse to object. Councillor Abdullatif suggested the Committee undertake a site visit to understand the concerns of residents and expressed that this was a huge development. There were 1,500 residents in the local estate and students would add 13,000 more into the area daily. This was not viable. The local houses were all low rise and the development was not in keeping with these surroundings. There would be a 29-storey tower, a small road and then two storey houses. The Committee were asked to take the residents' quality of life into consideration. The additional commuter traffic for this development would add to the already considerable strain felt by this community of Ardwick. Upper Brook Street was already a very polluted road and the Brunswick area one of the worst polluted in the country. The area is committed to nature conservation, as exemplified by the model green development area, funded by GMCA and supported by Manchester University. The local action group reject the scheme as being harmful to Gartside Gardens which is at risk of over-shadowing. Children understand the concerns of what this development means to local residents and the promises made do not go far enough. In her closing statement, Councillor Abdullatif asked the Committee to think about local people and reject this application.

Ward Councillor Muse addressed the Committee and stated that he was at the meeting to represent Ardwick. He stated that he and the residents were not against buildings of any kind but this development, next to two storey family homes, needed to be realistic. This scheme contradicts the council's own policies and the transient nature of student lifestyles would be challenging for the area. Students do not pay council tax and this scheme would be a larger student dwelling area than Fallowfield. There would be refuse and sewage problems, the medical centre was already overwhelmed and children in the area already have a high rate of asthma and eczema and other respiratory problems. Nurses have voiced their concerns about these issues and a 12 year old child had written a letter to ask that the Local Ward Councillors help them so that the development would not take their natural light. This child was a symbol of the area's future. There was no supermarket servicing the area and only one medical centre. It was stated that getting an appointment at the medical centre was akin to a lottery win. Councillor Muse implored the Committee to hear his impassioned plea for the community's future.

The Planning Officer addressed the concerns and stated that these were very long reports which covered all issues raised. The objective for Manchester City Council was to deliver life-science space over 650,000 square feet. The scheme had been tested for its viability and it was considered necessary to provide PBSA at this scale. The application had been reduced by 12 to 13 floors and the reduction represented the minimum required and had been tested independently. The resulting figures fed into the size of the life-science space and this was the amount that was required for the scheme to be viable. The scale and community had all been considered and it was understood that this was a large and imposing development, but the size of the development doesn't make it unacceptable. This would have to be tested against MCC and national policies. All implications of sunlight, noise, wind, air quality, traffic, parking and biodiversity etcetera were all set out clearly in the report.

The Chair invited Committee members to make comments or ask questions.

Councillor Johnson stated that it was important to consider the resident's point of view. She questioned how the air quality could not be worsened by the granting of this application, considering the additional traffic associated with the construction, staff and deliveries. This area already had high levels of air pollution. Car free areas should be prioritised, although cars are still required for expected online deliveries. Disabled people also rely on a certain number of parking space availability. Regarding the claim of increased biodiversity in the report, Councillor Johnson noted that tree planting was part of the scheme but it was not a particularly green plot, compared to the size of the buildings. The public realm appeared to be walkways with bushes and trees. The scheme may address the strategic framework in adding to a vibrant city but this needed to be balanced with the impact on local communities. The addition of this development, if agreed, would change the face of Ardwick for the future and potentially exclude families from living near the city centre. Councillor Johnson noted that the size of the development had been noted as not relevant and asked how this was so and agreed with the objector's call for a site visit and proposed this as a motion.

Councillor Hewitson seconded the proposal for a site visit stating that this development does not sit well in this location.

Councillor Davies sought clarity on some site plans in the report.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the site plans were covered under the second application under item 6 in the agenda.

The Planning Officer then responded to Councillor Johnson's comments on air quality by referring to page 96 and 97 where it was stated that construction could have some impact unless subject to mitigation, although these measures were set out in the report. After construction, this was to be a largely car-free scheme and colleagues in Environmental Health state that there would be zero impact, also detailed in the report. There were already two other huge car parks nearby at the Aquatic Centre and Circle Square which currently operated at around 35% capacity. There were also detailed strategies for deliveries within the report. Over the two sites there would be 3 acres of public realm. In terms of the impact of students on the community, there were large numbers of students occupying mainstream accommodation in Ardwick.

Homes are being used to house students with 47% of these houses in Ardwick being built to rent. There was a need to build PBSA where students were choosing to live as without it there was additional pressure on family accommodation and these numbers would rise.

The Director of Planning addressed Councillor Johnson's comments by stating that the permanent impacts of the scheme were all addressed within both reports, this was a brownfield site earmarked for development unless there were material considerations opposing this. There were social, economic and environmental benefits, creating much needed jobs and high quality jobs, additional to the PBSA also set out within the report.

Councillor Andrews Stated that he understood the requirement for additional PBSA in Manchester but agreed with Councillor Hewitson that a site visit was necessary to fully understand the impact to local residents.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve a motion for a site visit for both applications in order to fully understand the potential impact of the developments on the local community.

PH/24/89. 138126/OO/2023 - University of Manchester Fallowfield Campus Wilmslow Road, Manchester M14 6HD - Fallowfield Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding an outline planning application (with access only in detail) for the phased demolition of existing buildings and phased development of up to 3,300 Purpose Built Student Accommodation bedrooms (Sui Generis use class) with associated facilities including waste storage, laundry and cycle storage; up to 4,500 sq m of floorspace to be used for ancillary purposes associated with the student residential use of the site within Use Class F1a, Class E(a), E(b), E(c), E(d), E(g), Sui Generis (drinking establishment and hot food takeaway); ancillary supporting staff accommodation (up to 55 bedrooms) (Sui Generis use class), and up to 1,200 sq m of ancillary residential dwellings (Use Class C3), plus associated car parking, hard and soft landscaping, open space, utilities, footpaths and roads.

The application related to the redevelopment of part of the University of Manchester student halls of residence at its Fallowfield Campus within the Fallowfield ward. Planning permission had previously been granted for its demolition and redevelopment as part of a wider scheme to provide additional bedspaces at the Campus. The application sought to update the University's proposals to modernise the campus and provide further additional capacity at the site to address the need within the City for further purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA).

The Planning Officer noted the additional objections in the late representations report from local community groups and confirmed that all matters raised were already addressed in the report.

An objector attended the hearing and addressed the Committee stating that the scheme clashed with local and national policies and legal precedents. As an outline application, the most impactful features would be reserved matters, meaning that the Committee would not get to deliberate if they approved the proposal today. There were no particular details on the amount of bed spaces. An additional influx of wealthy students would cause harm to Fallowfield by way of 100,000 tons of carbon, in excess of legal limits in the area. Children have to walk past this area daily and also people with respiratory conditions. This scheme was contrary to the council's own air quality policies. Bat protection was questioned and 14 bat roosts were mentioned. It was a criminal offence to remove bat roosts. This was a student fortress with no mixed use, no public rights of way and contrary to the core strategy. The Planning Officer may not have been well advised on this application. The Committee were being asked to make a decision on an unknown quantity and it was expressed that this application was a Trojan horse.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee stating that this was a major investment and core part of the developer's portfolio and would provide 4,500 safe student dwellings spaces. It was mentioned that Manchester's growth had been partly due to the student population with many choosing to settle in the city and contribute. This was a globally competitive marketplace. Fallowfield played an important role in this field but the site drastically needed modernisation. There was growing demand for accommodation for overseas students which was currently not matched by growth in the provision of dedicated accommodation. There were challenges in meeting these accommodation commitments. This application presented a phased transformation of the current campus to address key points. There would be a variety of dwelling sizes and price points to allow affordable options. There would be ancillary facilities to make the campus self-sufficient. There would be 950 extra bedspaces, additional to the current offering. This was a modest increase which would allow for 2nd and 3rd year students to return to the site and lessen the use of mainstream housing stock. There would be additional tree planting and the retention of green spaces. This scheme would build on what was already a student campus and would be subject to effective management. There was a level of local concern and communications with the community had been addressed with officers to work together.

Ward Councillor Ilyas addressed the Committee stating that he understood the need for student accommodation and that the number of HMOs and PBSA in the proximity of this proposal is an issue for community cohesion. Councillor Ilyas did not agree that it was HMOs and not PBSA that caused the main problems as the impacts can be caused by the people and organisations within the community. This proposed expansion in the heart of the community put it at breaking point and would exacerbate the need for HMOs. Councillor Ilyas supported PBSA but the policy needed to take account of the community. The scheme was not in line with MCC policy and was imbalanced. The council had already spent time and resources tackling anti-social behaviour, litter and other associated issues and he questioned the legitimacy of pouring more public money into this problem which could undo years of work.

Ward Councillor Doswell addressed the Committee and stated that the regeneration of the site and the improvement of standards of student accommodation was

welcomed. Councillor Doswell was in attendance to represent both residents and students and expressed that they should not pit one against the other. She felt that the application fell short of key information, most notably the number of bedspaces. The Planning Officers have stated that there will be a “reserved matters” application to follow for determination but the Committee need to know what they are voting on today. There needed to be an indication of the number of bedspaces in order for the Committee to be able to make a clear decision. Also, there was no mention of the capacity of staff dwellings on the site. This was less a question of who but more about how many and Councillor Doswell expressed concerns about costs and lower income students. Working class students felt priced out of accommodation in the city and it was noted that 20% of the rooms should be let at an affordable rate if agreed, with the NUS definition or 20% discount on the market rate. Regarding current issues, there were mid-week complaints about noise, litter and anti-social behaviour in this area. Students tend to live in PBSA for the first year and then find a cheaper HMO. Due to this practice, this proposal would be unsustainable in 5 years time. Private developers will build more PBSA and plans are lodged every week for the Fallowfield Ward. Councillor Doswell disagreed that this proposal met with Manchester City Council policy, adding that the application relating to Oakley Villa on Wilmslow Road for 425 bedspaces was considered contrary to the core strategy. The university should seek to develop better relationships with local residents and Councillor Doswell requested that the Committee reject this application to work towards a better development.

The Planning Officer stated that there was a detailed report which covered all issues raised. The next stage of the application was reserved for future consideration with this application being before the Committee to set parameters to guide the following proposal with outline applications being wholly normal practice within the planning application process. With regard to reserved matters in a future application, it was noted that there would be 5,300 bedspaces, an extra 950 to what was currently possible on-site. The application complied with all policies and this was set out within the report. There was specific policy advice in the core strategy noting potential to intensify development at this campus. Regarding bat roosts, there would need to be a licence granted from Natural England and no work could progress until the licence was granted. In terms of the campus being a “student fortress,” the setting is the same as the site has never had a public right of way. The outer tree belt would be retained. There was a clear footprint whereby development can take place and that this will take place within 35% of the developable area. Also identified were height restrictions for certain zones. When the reserved matters application comes forward, the application will be fully tested again and brought to Committee. In the USDAW planning appeal, the inspector had stated that they felt this application was acceptable as a concept, their refusal was more concerning design, scale and mass. The inspector did not find that the increase in numbers was unacceptable, on the contrary, they stated that it would be an improvement to students living in HMOs. The last 10 years has seen a 29% drop in council tax exemption in South Manchester and a move towards the city centre and/or PBSA. In terms of affordability, the scheme was not subjected to other market pressures, plus there was not enough PBSA hence a higher cost. The matter had been discussed with the Neighbourhoods Team within the city council and it was noted that the larger impact of students was caused by them living in HMOs.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions or make comments.

Councillor Curley proposed a site visit to have a greater understanding of the proposal within its surroundings.

Councillor Johnson seconded the proposal and stated that this application was similar to the previous Ardwick applications as there was a strong community voice. She requested information on the drop in council tax exemptions and whether there was any data available to show that students choose to move home. Councillor Johnson noted that there was clearly a need for more PBSA and asked if there could be a condition to address the issue of cohesion and integration between the two communities, residents and students.

Councillor Gartside stated that she was aware and recognised the need for further PBSA in the city; an additional 950 bedspaces and asked if there was any available information on 2nd and 3rd year students dwelling choices, how many HMOs were being made available and whether this applied to 1st, 2nd and 3rd year students.

The Planning Officer stated that the council's Executive had set out that there was not enough PBSA, reporting that 10,000 rooms across the city had been set as the necessary amount, with the Planning and Highways Committee having approved 3,500 so far. It was reported that 670 homes had been made available due to the expansion of PBSA in the city and that providing an alternative was the only way to keep this trend up. The Planning Officer stated that community engagement cannot be added as a Planning Condition but noted that the applicant/agent was in the meeting and would be able to take this away. If the Committee voted for a site visit, then more information could be brought back to a later meeting.

Councillor S Ali agreed that there should be a site visit.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve a motion for a site visit in order to fully understand the potential impact of the development on the local community.

PH/24/90. 136558/FO/2023 - 46 Henry Street, Manchester, M4 5DD - Ancoats & Beswick Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding an application for use of ground and first floor as a restaurant (Use Class E) together with elevational alterations and other associated external works.

The application related to elevational alterations, including extending and creating a first floor to the building, in association with the creation of a restaurant.

Six letters of objection had been received from two households.

The Planning Officer had nothing to add to the printed report.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee and stated that they had worked with conservation officers on the planning and design process. The building would have zinc cladding and the overall design would be a vast improvement. The application was originally to be dealt with under delegated powers, but public concerns led to revisions being made with no public access to the 1st floor and a serving hatch removed from the plans as a potential source of anti-social behaviour. The rooftop plant and odour extraction system would have no effect on neighbouring residencies. The Ancoats area and immediate surroundings were home to thriving bars and restaurants and this would be an addition with a maximum cover of 18 diners. A smoking and CCTV policy had also been put in place. All available information was in the report and the agent expressed that he was looking forward to adding to the thriving food and drink economy in the Ancoats area.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

Councillor Lovecy stated that this was a welcome application with community engagement and an improvement on the current setting.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve the application subject to the conditions within the report.

PH/24/91. 137537/FO/2023 - Withington Community Hospital, Nell Lane, Manchester, M20 2LR - Didsbury West Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of a two-storey building comprising a Community Diagnostics Centre (use class E(e)), with associated external landscaping, patient and delivery drop off area and 6 no. accessible parking spaces.

The planning application was for the erection of a two-storey building comprising a Community Diagnostics Centre (use class E(e)), with associated external landscaping, patient and delivery drop off area and 6 no. accessible parking spaces at the site of Withington Community Hospital on Nell Lane in the Didsbury West Ward.

The key issues with this application were:

- The need and benefit of the new centre
- The impact on the local environment
- The impact on the local traffic and parking

It was acknowledged there were concerns with the proposals, particularly around car parking and the potential impact on the local area; however, as set out in the report it was considered the proposal, which would provide a valuable new Health Care facility, must be carefully balanced with the overall public benefits holding significant

weight. It was also recognised that this is a sustainable location near tram stops and bus routes, and other local facilities which provides significant opportunity to assist in modal shift from the private car whilst also having access to off-street car parking for those users where alternatives are not viable.

Other matters raised by objectors were also fully addressed.

The Planning Officer referred the Committee to an additional condition in the late representations report.

The applicant's agent from the NHS Foundation Trust addressed the Committee on the application and stated that there had been a £2.3bn investment from the government. This had identified Manchester and Trafford as key beneficiaries of the scheme. Withington Hospital was already recognised as a key medical hub for the South Manchester area. This centre was well placed to measure the impact of cardio-respiratory issues on local health. The principle of this development was considered acceptable. This medical centre was located in a residential area with the design maximising the functionality of the building. Solar panels, net zero targets, low carbon and sustainable transport methods would help to meet strategic policies in the city. There would be 10 cycle spaces and 6 EV charging points all part of the travel plan for the scheme. There was also an action plan to consider short, medium and long term travel developments. There had been engagement with stakeholders and Local Ward Councillors. To assist with any potential for a rise in on-street car parking, there had been a rise from 30 to 60 mins of free parking for users of the hospital. The development complies with the local and national framework and would be a benefit to the development of a healthy population.

Ward Councillor Hilal addressed the Committee stating that she was in favour of the proposal, but had received complaints from residents about staff parking on residential streets. Councillor Hilal joined residents to observe this in the early hours of the morning and conducted research with staff members on why they were doing this. Staff of the hospital stated that they were being charged £3 per hour to park at the hospital and could not afford to do so. Charges for staff are based on wage. Councillor Hilal spoke to management at the hospital, asking if staff could have 3 hours free parking as they were having a negative effect on local residents. The management rejected this proposal. Also, cancer patients of the hospital were not aware that they were entitled to free parking and it was questioned how the hospital could feed this information to these patients in a clear way to avoid more on-street parking. There had been an agreement in the report for all users of the hospital to have 60 minutes of free parking, which was an increase from the previous 30 minutes. Also, the hospital was supportive of the use of their car park for residents between the hours of 8pm and 6am. Residents had previously rejected a parking scheme and Councillor Hilal and Jeff Smith MP had met with objectors to assist with an agreement between them and the hospital. It had been determined that the proposed unit will employ 30 additional staff and more patients were expected to visit and that would need consideration.

The Chair invited the Director of Planning to make a comment to the hospital trust on the overnight parking arrangement.

The Director of Planning stated that this was certainly an agreeable option and expressed her gratitude to all concerned and involved in the discussions. There was already a travel plan arranged for this application and the Director of Planning stated that she would write to the trust to set out terms for a potential overnight parking plan.

The Planning Officer added that the applicant was committed to the travel plan and that this was flexible to incorporate future changes.

Councillor Andrews was pleased to hear all the efforts and discussions that had taken place around this application and moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application, subject to conditions and amendments.

Councillor Gartside seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve the application, subject to conditions and amendments within the reports.

PH/24/92. 138127/OO/2023 - Express Solicitors, 313-315 and 317-319 Palatine Road, Manchester, M22 4HH - Northenden Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding an outline planning application (with matters of access, layout and scale for approval) for demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site for up to 34 apartments and 3 townhouses (Use Class C3).

The planning application had been submitted in outline for the redevelopment of the site following demolition of all buildings and erection of a 5 storey building to comprise 34 apartments located along the Palatine Road frontage of the site, together with 3 no. town houses to be located along the Allanson Road frontage. The application had been submitted in outline with matters relating to access, layout and scale being submitted in detail, with matters relating to the appearance and landscaping being reserved for future reserved matters applications.

The key issues with this application were:

- The scale of the building and its impact on the character and visual amenity of the area
- Potential impacts on the residential amenity of residential properties in the area
- The provision of affordable housing on the site
- The impact on the local traffic and parking
- The flood risk associated with the site

It was acknowledged there were concerns with the proposals, particularly around car parking and the potential impact on the local area; however, as set out in the report it was considered that the proposal would provide residential properties on brownfield land in a sustainable location with a policy compliant proportion of these being for affordable housing.

This application appears on the meeting agenda with another application submitted by the applicant for the redevelopment of another of their office sites located in Northenden for residential development in close proximity to this application proposal that application is reference number 138128/OO/2023.

Other matters raised by objectors are also addressed.

The Planning Officer had nothing to add to the printed report.

The applicant attended and addressed the Committee on the application, stating that this solicitor's firm had started out with 1 member of staff and grown to employ numerous staff, as exemplified by the use of building before the Committee today. The company had required further expansion and acquired a new site on the Sharston Estate. This had led the company into re-purposing the building as "accidental developers." The 1950s era building had been investigated for its potential to be converted into housing stock and it was considered not viable. The two items before the Committee today (items 10 Express Solicitors & 11 Transformulas House) were part of the same development and would be a useful site for housing and some affordable homes. In terms of parking, there were 40 spaces currently but this renovation would lead to less traffic and less parking due to the amount of staff being moved off-site. The townhouse each have a garage as part of the plot and the apartments had a 70% parking provision which had satisfied the Highways Officer.

Ward Councillor Moran addressed the Committee stating that she thanked the agent and welcomed new houses to the area. Parking was a concern in this Ward but the other Local Ward Councillors were not opposed to housing on this site as more housing was required. New houses would need to deliver for residents in a sustainable way. The main concern was that the houses were terraced with no driveways and this may cause parking problems due to the 24 parking spaces available for the whole development as some households will have 2 cars. Another concern was the loss of retail units on the high street. Northenden had been improving with new restaurants and cafes in recent years which residents were in favour of. Further to this was the lack of any green space or enhancement of existing green spaces for these future occupants. The environmental effects of the demolition with no option to retro fit was another concern. Councillor Moran asked the Committee to please consider these concerns when making their decision. Regarding the most contentious element being car parking, she asked if officers would work with the developer to mitigate any impacts on the community.

The Director of Planning stated that this was a very balanced report. All affordable housing is a bonus but the Planning Team were aware that parking is a big issue. The team would be working on the Section 106 agreement so further car parking arrangements could be discussed at that point.

The Planning Officer stated that this was an outline application with a reserved matters application to follow in future, going into more detail therefore landscaping could be given further inspection. There is a travel plan in place with 100% cycle parking in the district centre and less car parking required, as suggested by the applicant due to the residents being in smaller numbers than the previous staff of the unit. Currently there was no retail unit operational on the site and the current unit

didn't lend itself well to this. These residential homes would also support the district centre.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions or make comments.

Councillor Andrews enquired on what an "informative" was with regard to the report.

The Planning Officer stated that it was not a condition of the planning permission, but concerning issues the developer had to be aware of that cannot be dealt with via planning process.

Councillor Andrews then moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application with an understanding that there would be conversations between the planning team and the developer to address issues raised by the Ward Councillor before the reserved matters application was placed before the Committee.

Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be minded to approve the application subject to conditions within the report, subject to the completion of a section 106 agreement relating to on-site provision of 20% affordable housing.

PH/24/93. 138128/OO/2023 - Transformulas House, 1A Brett Street, Manchester, M22 4EY - Northenden Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding outline planning permission (with matters of access, layout and scale for approval) for demolition of all existing buildings and redevelopment of site for 2 townhouses (Use Class C3).

The planning application had been submitted in outline for the redevelopment of the site following demolition of all buildings and erection of 2 no three storey townhouses. The application had been submitted in outline with matters relating to access, layout and scale being submitted in detail, with matters relating to the appearance and landscaping being reserved for future reserved matters applications.

The key issues with this application were:

- The scale of the building and its impact on the character and visual amenity of the area
- Potential impacts on the residential amenity of residential properties in the area
- The impact on the local traffic and parking
- The flood risk associated with the site

This application appeared on the meeting agenda with another application submitted by the applicant for the redevelopment of another of their office sites located in Northenden for residential development in close proximity to this application proposal at 313 – 319 Palatine Road. The application number is 138127/OO/2023.

The Planning Officer had nothing to add to the printed report.

The applicant did not add anything by way of a statement to the Committee.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions or make comments.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve the application subject to conditions within the report.

PH/24/94. 137172/FH/2023 - 126 Chichester Road, Manchester, M15 5DZ - Hulme Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of a single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation.

This application was considered by a meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on the 16 November 2023 where Members resolved to defer consideration in order for additional images of the extension to be included within the report. This would also provide some understanding of the course of events leading to the extension being partly erected providing visual context. These images had now been included in the main body of the report. Concern was also expressed by Members that this application is retrospective. It is the case that a retrospective application is fully assessed in the same way as any other application and the extension, the subject of this application, had been fully considered on its individual merits.

The Planning Officer stated that visual aspects had now been provided to the Committee in the report.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor Curley seconded the proposal.

Councillor Lovecy stated that the Committee had requested that some builds be taken down retroactively and asked if this application met planning policies.

The Director of Planning confirmed that this application did meet the city council's planning policies.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve the application subject to conditions within the report.

PH/24/95. 138378/FH/2023 - 54 Ardern Road, Manchester, M8 4NW - Crumpsall Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of part single, part two storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation.

The application sought planning permission for the erection of part single, part two storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation.

During the course of the application, it came to light the applicant works for Manchester City Council and for that reason it was necessary for the application to be presented to Committee for consideration. One representation from a neighbour had been received raising concern about the proposal in relation to loss of light.

Key issues related to the proposal's impact upon neighbouring occupiers with regard to loss of light and the visual appearance as well as the impact on the character of the area in general. These issues were fully considered within the main body of the report.

The Planning Officer had nothing to add to the printed report.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions or make comments.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve the application subject to conditions within the report.