

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 15 February 2024

Present: Councillor Lyons (Chair)

Councillors: Andrews, Chohan, Curley, Davies, Gartside, Hassan, Hewitson, Hughes, Kamal, J Lovecy and Riasat

Apologies: Councillor Shaukat Ali and Johnson

Also present: Councillors: T Judge and Taylor

PH/24/9. Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 138768/VO/2023, 138712/FO/2023, and 138730/FO/2023.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/24/10. Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2024 as a correct record.

PH/24/11. 138294/FO/2023 - Land At Plymouth Grove Manchester

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of a part six storey, part eight storey building for use as purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA) (Sui Generis) comprising 263 bed spaces, with associated amenity space, cycle parking, external landscaping, access and other associated works.

The application proposed a 6 to 8 storey purpose building student accommodation (PBSA) building with ground floor amenity space.

Two previous planning permission had been granted at the site for a 7-storey building for residential purposes and occupied a similar footprint to the proposed development.

6 objections had been received.

The Planning Officer confirmed that Committee members had been on a site visit, where questions were raised. One of those related to the relationship between the proposed development with neighbouring properties, including 21 Plymouth Grove. The Planning Officer stated that the relationship was acceptable and was also in line

with the parameters established under the 2017 permission that remained extant. A further question was raised relating to the layby and provision of disabled parking on Dryden Street. It was noted that this issue had been considered in the printed report and there was no principal issue relating to highway and pedestrian safety.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee, stating that the development was purpose-built student accommodation, specifically marketed at second and third-year students. The development would reuse a vacant brownfield site that is in close proximity to the core university areas. The site had previously had two planning permissions for residential properties and this development occupied a similar footprint to a previous permission. The design was of high quality and would contribute positively to the area. The application fully accorded with Policy H12 and would bring economic benefits of the creation of 130 jobs during construction. There would be an affordable element within the development. The development would meet identified need for new student accommodation in a sustainable location near to the university.

A member commented that they were disappointed there was a lack of greenery at the borders of the development.

The Planning Officer noted that the report provided the landscaping and public realm layout at page 62. The development would be set back and would not reach the footpath edge, which would allow for a degree of public realm around the perimeters. They noted there would be two principal areas of soft landscaping and recreational space that would provide biodiversity and ecology benefits.

Councillor Andrews moved the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Riasat seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement to secure the provision of affordable rented accommodation, that private waste collections would take place for the perpetuity of the development and secure the project architect.

PH/24/12. 138424/FO/2023 - All Saints Campus Oxford Road Manchester M15 6BH

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the part demolition and redevelopment of existing library building to form new library (Use Class F1) including a new 13 storey building, external amenity spaces, public realm, access, and servicing arrangements and other associated works.

The proposal was for the part demolition of the All Saints Library and All Saints Building, and erection of a 13-storey library building with amenity spaces and public realm.

Two letters of objection had been received from the same individual.

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

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee, noting that the application had been brought forward by Manchester Metropolitan University as the next stage in investment in their estate. The application would provide a further world class facility, adding to the appearance and environment of the Oxford Road corridor. It would replace an outdated library with a modern, dynamic library environment, fostering community and belonging. It was noted that the existing library did not hold sustainability credentials, and these proposals were a low carbon and sustainable design. It was stated that the overwhelming majority of feedback received in consultation was positive.

A member sought clarity on disabled parking provision within the application. A member also sought assurance that the design as applied for was what would be delivered if approved.

The Planning Officer noted that there was no specific parking provision contained within the application. The development was to be situated on a campus that already had those facilities for those who required it. The Planning Officer also noted that they had challenged the applicant on if the application was deliverable. They had been reassured by the applicant that it was a buildable scheme.

Councillor Andrews moved the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Chohan seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Approve the application.

PH/24/13. 138768/VO/2023 - 258 Brownley Road Manchester M22 5EB

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding a City Council development which was to change the use of a former probation centre (Class E) to a homeless shelter for up to 20 homeless people (sui generis).

The conversion of a vacant probation centre to a homeless shelter would provide 20 bedrooms for single homeless people, incorporating communal living areas, staffroom, and parking.

Objections had been received from 92 local residents, together with 2 letters of support.

The main concerns raised related to the proximity of the proposed use to a neighbouring children's day nursery and safeguarding issues; anti-social/criminal behaviour perceived to be generated by prospective residents; the use of the open space opposite and interaction with children; the impact to nearby property values

and the provision of satisfactory operational arrangements, to ensure that the development does not harm the living conditions of nearby residential occupiers.

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

A representative for the applicant attended and addressed the Committee, noting the application would provide temporary accommodation for homeless people within Manchester who require low to medium support. The site would be managed by a team leader, with ten staff on a 24/7 rota. There would be a minimum of three staff on site at all times. Residents would be in this accommodation for a maximum of six months, with most moving on quicker. The applicant had a proven track record of managing such establishments successfully. All residents would sign a licence agreement that if broken would mean them losing their place in the accommodation. The accommodation would have a no visitor policy. It was noted that there was a shortage of this type of accommodation in the South of Manchester. The engagement pre-application was wider than usual.

A Sharston ward Councillor addressed the Committee, noting the close proximity to their ward of the application but that they had not been consulted at the same time as Woodhouse Park ward councillors. They felt that Sharston residents needed assurances that the site would be properly managed, and their concerns could not be ignored. They requested that the Committee complete a site visit before determining the application. In particular, the ward Councillor wanted the Committee to look at the impact on parking, litter, anti-social behaviour, security, CCTV and other operational arrangements.

The Planning Officer noted that the consultation was in excess of the statutory requirements and that the local community were aware of the proposed development with over 90 comments received. A drop-in event had been held in Sharston to discuss resident concerns. It is necessary to consider the material planning impacts and whether these could be mitigated, and as part of the consideration a detailed management plan, detailed in the report, would form a condition of planning permission and the implementation of this plan would mitigate against any harm. The existing lawful planning use of the building was that of offices and there is no control in relation to intensity of use or hours of operation. The premises could be used for a number of other uses without requiring an application for planning permission and this includes retail, restaurant or day nursery, again, without any control over intensity of use or hours of operation. The Planning Officer stated that conditions within the application would address the concerns that had been raised.

A member queried if the Planning Officer could confirm which post codes the objections had been received from.

A member accepted that the consultation had been wider than required. They felt that the success of these types of accommodation relied on management and good staff upholding the management plan. The member supported the idea of a site visit.

The Planning Officer did not have a break down of figures relating to where objections had been received from but noted it was a mixture of Woodhouse Park and Sharston residents. They noted that the management plan was clearly detailed

within the report and that the site would be managed by the Council's homelessness team.

Councillor Curley moved a proposal for the Committee to complete a site visit.

Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve the motion for a site visit.

PH/24/14. 138765/FO/2023 - Wren House 108 Palatine Road Manchester M20 3ZA

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of a three-storey building to provide 37 retirement living apartments (comprising 24 no. 1 bed and 13 no. 2 beds) including communal facilities, access, car parking and landscaping and reconfigured car parking arrangement for Wren House.

The application proposals were for the redevelopment of an area of land previously used as surface car parking associated with a former public house on the southwest corner of the junction between Lapwing Lane and Palatine Road in the Didsbury West Ward. The proposals were for the development of a three-storey building to provide 37no. retirement living apartments.

The site is located within the Albert Park Conservation Area and lies adjacent to both Ballbrook and Blackburn Park Conservation Areas. The key issues for consideration of this application were:

- The provision of older person accommodation in this area
- Impacts on the character and appearance of the conservation area
- Impacts on residential amenity of existing residents particularly in respect of privacy and overlooking
- Impacts on trees
- Level of car parking provision
- Density, scale and layout of the proposals

Following notification of the application 4 representations were received including 3 objections and 1 in support. The issues raised related to: the need for this type of residential provision in this area; the scale and design of the proposed building, and the level of car parking. These issues together with other matters were fully considered within the report.

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

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee, noting that the application was for 37 retirement apartments that would be well served by local amenities. The apartments would be situated in a sustainable location. They noted that the housing strategy accepted the need for this type of residential property. They felt the application was comparable in scale to neighbouring buildings and that the

level of parking proposed was sufficient. They stated that the applicant was happy for conditions to be attached to the planning permission as the Committee saw appropriate.

The Planning Officer noted that they supported the principle of the use of the site for retirement living, but the details of the scheme were not appropriate and acceptable in this context within a conservation area, particularly the scale, mass, and materials to be used in construction. They felt the application was out of character with the area. There was also 3-storeys running along the boundary with a neighbouring house and issues relating to overlooking. The Planning Officer stated that this could not be alleviated through the imposition of conditions.

A member raised concerns that the applicant had not worked with Planning Officers to find acceptable conditions.

Councillor Curley moved the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Gartside seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Refuse the application.

PH/24/15. 138712/FO/2023 - B&M Home Store Burnage Kingsway Manchester M19 1BB

The Committee were informed that the item had been formally withdrawn and therefore no determination was necessary.

PH/24/16. 138730/FO/2023 - Land Bounded By Oldham Road (A62), Old Church Street, The Lidl Foodstore And Newton Street Manchester M40 1EZ

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of 3 and 6 storey buildings to form 81 residential apartments (Use Class C3a) and erection of 28, two storey dwellinghouses (Use Class C3a), including green spaces, landscaping, boundary treatment, access arrangements, parking and other associated works.

The proposal would create 109 new homes, all would be affordable (either social rent or affordable rent), within two apartment buildings of 3 and 6 storey and two storey dwellinghouses. There would be public realm, parking and an off-site contribution of £110,000 for environmental improvements, place making and linkages within Newton Heath District Centre. Social Value would also be captured through a local labour agreement. The applicant was committed to ensure that local residents benefit from the development through access to employment.

Part of the site benefited from an extant planning permission for residential purposes. The remaining part of the site, the former Rosedale site, had previously been granted

planning permission for a building which was significantly larger (at 10 storeys) than this proposal. This permission had expired.

This proposal presented a significant opportunity to transform a highly prominent vacant site along a main road route in the City together with having a positive impact on the ongoing transformation of Newton Heath district centre.

This development, together with an adjacent scheme being delivered by the applicant, would deliver 146 new affordable homes across the two developments.

Cllr Hitchen and Cllr Flanagan both object to the proposal.

The Director of Planning noted that many schemes are subject to funding or need to seek funding to be realised. They felt this was a much-needed scheme, providing 100% affordable housing, but that a determination was required to enable the applicant to seek funding required.

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

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee, noting that the application was for 100% affordable housing on an unused Brownfield site. The application would bring 109 new homes, a mix of affordable and social rented housing. Three of those homes would be fully accessible for wheelchair users and all other homes would be adaptable. More than half of the proposed homes were 2 or more bedrooms, intended for families. The remaining 1-bedroom homes would be targeted at smaller families or those who can downsize, enabling larger family homes within One Manchester's portfolio to be freed up. The applicant was committed to entering into a local labour agreement, ensuring construction jobs were made available to Manchester residents. The applicant had agreed to a financial agreement via a Section 106 agreement for environmental improvements, place making and linkages within Newton Heath District Centre. New green infrastructure was also to be provided across the site.

A local ward Councillor addressed the Committee, noting that they did not object to the applications intention to provide affordable and social rented accommodation. Their objection related to the Section 106 agreement and how the £110,000 would be spent. They requested that the financial settlement be spent on the public realm around the nearby library, parking and the disamenity the development would cause.

The Planning Officer noted that the legal agreement states that the financial agreement was for a contribution to improve public spaces and facilities and create a well-designed environment, all of which related to the issues raised by the local ward Councillor.

The Chair requested assurances that local ward Councillors would be involved in discussions relating to the Section 106 agreement.

The Director of Planning noted that the wording in the agreement was loose, and that local ward Councillors could be involved in those discussions.

A member questioned how many of the 109 homes would be social housing.

A member noted that the report states 81 homes would be social housing and sought an assurance that would not be able to change after approval.

A member then requested that the wording of the Section 106 agreement be tweaked to provide assurances that local ward Councillors are involved in discussions.

The Director of Planning stated that it could not be added to the wording on a Section 106 agreement relating to local ward Councillors involvement, but the wording was flexible enough for allowing those discussions to take place around what would be delivered. They assured members that local ward Councillors would be consulted and that the Planning team would guide what was legitimate.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there would be 81 social rented accommodation, and that was controlled by condition 41 in the report.

Councillor Andrews moved the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Curley seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement to secure a financial contribution towards environmental improvements.