

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 1 June 2023**

**Present:** Councillor Lyons (Chair)

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

**Apologies:** Councillor Chohan, Johnson and Ludford

**Also present:** Councillors:

#### **PH/23/33. Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 135419/FO/2022, 133324/FO/2022 and 133323/LO/2022, 135419/FO/2022, 136551/FO/2023, 135647/FO/2022 and 135936/FO/2023

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/23/34. Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 13 April 2023 as a correct record.

#### **PH/23/35. 135662/FO/2022 - Laystall Street / Great Ancoats Street Manchester M4 6DE - Piccadilly Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that presented an application relating to the erection of a 20 storey building to create a 154 bedroom hotel (Class C1) above 2 basement levels with ancillary café / bar / restaurant and gym and other associated works including highway improvements, cycle parking and creation of accessible parking bay following removal of on site structures.

Seven letters of objection had been received (including three from the same party) and one anonymous letter. The grounds of objections were concerning the design, traffic impacts of reconfiguring the Laystall Street junction, inadequate pre-application consultation and the prejudicial impact of developing this site in isolation of the adjoining site.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report or late representations received.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee stating the design of the building proposed made efficient use of the site whilst not compromising any development on adjacent land. The applicant had an excellent track record and reputation for delivering and operating hotel development across the UK. Proposals were designed to deliver a high quality building, developed in close consultation with Council officers. The proposals had been subject to rigorous townscape and heritage assessments and would meet highest of sustainable construction standards and would reduce the demand for alternative form of visitor accommodation in the city.

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

Councillor Hewitson addressed the Committee and sought clarity on the proposed amendment to the road layout and direction exiting Laystall Street. In connection to this Councillor Davies sought clarity as to whether the proposed change had come from the Council's Highways department as part of a wider programme of changes to road layouts or whether any consultation with local residents had taken place. Councillor S Ali also expressed his concern in relation to the proposed traffic remodelling.

The Planning Officer confirmed that at present traffic exiting Laystall Street could turn left or right. Within the proposals submitted, traffic would only be able to turn left. This proposal had been subjected to traffic modelling and it had been determined that this proposal would have no adverse effect on traffic and would improve the environment for pedestrians around the site. In addition, it was confirmed that the proposed change had been submitted by the applicant and discussed and whist agreed by the Council's Highways Department. the proposal would still need to a formal Section 278 agreement and if it did not pass, alternative proposals would need to be considered, however, this should not affect the application going forward.

Councillor Andrews sought clarity on whether the application would need to be reconsidered by the Committee should the Section 278 agreement not be passed.

The Planning Officer advised that if the Section 278 Agreement was not passed, the application could still go forward subject to a minor modification to the application in relation to the proposed traffic modelling.

Councillor Curley enquired as to whether there was any possibility of increasing the number of proposed disabled parking bays.

The Planning Officer advised that in addition to the proposed disabled bay, the applicant would also be providing a valet parking service a spart of the operational management plan.

Councillor Andrews proposed a motion to approve the application.

Councillor Hughes seconded Councillor Andrews's proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee Approves the application as set out in the report submitted.

**PH/23/36. 135675/FO/2022 - Tariff Street Manchester - Piccadilly Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that presented an application regarding the erection of two residential apartment buildings (Use Class C3) comprising Block 1 -part 9, part 10 and Block 2-12 storey building (comprising of 261 dwellings in total), with ground floor commercial units (Use Class E), associated residents amenity space, cycle parking, landscaping, access, street loading and other associated works following demolition of the existing building on site.

30 letters had been received from three rounds of neighbour notification from a total 24 objectors. The objections related to design, heritage, amenity, servicing, sunlight and daylight, wind impacts on external spaces, highways and non-compliance with the Piccadilly Basin SRF.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report.

An objector attended and addressed the Committee on the application, raising concerns fire safety, specifically in relation to the proposed Block Two, which proposed only one staircase which was non-compliant. Concerns were also made around the wind report, that the application deviated from the SRF, no consultation had been given to local heritage assets and removable of public realms, loss of day light to neighbouring residential properties and overdevelopment of the site

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee, stating that the proposal before committee represented positive discussions with Planning Officers and was in line with key principles within the Piccadilly Basin SRF. The proposals met and exceeded design standards and the proposed scale and massing responded to the historic mills and would deliver well designed accommodation that would be sympathetic to the area. The proposal was consistent with the strategic vision for the area and there would be an initial £250k contribution to affordable housing with a further viability assessment secured to allow this to be reassessed . It was stated that the current site made little contribution to the heritage of the area and the proposal would contribute to the delivery of new homes in the city.

The Planning Officer provided clarification on the issues raised by the objector. Specifically in relation to fire safety, he advised the Committee that this was not an issue for the planning process. It was for the Committee to determine on land use planning issues. It would be for Building Control to determine on fire safety and if changes were needed, this would result in a new application which could be in the form of a non material change, material change or new application, which may need to be subjected to consideration by the Committee again.

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

Councillor Curley addressed the Committee, welcoming the securing of the Section 106 agreement toward affordable housing. He proposed a motion to approve the

officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement in relation to an initial off site affordable housing contribution, with a future review of the affordable housing position

Councillor S Ali seconded Councillor Curley's proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement in relation to an initial off site affordable housing contribution, with a future review of the affordable housing position.

### **PH/23/37. 133324/FO/2022 & 133323/LO/2022 - Ancoats Works Pollard Street Norfolk Street Manchester M4 7DS - Ancoats & Beswick Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that proposed the erection of two, part 8, part 4 storey buildings and refurbishment of the southern part of the Ancoats Works building to Pollard Street to form 183 residential apartments and 10 duplex apartments (Use Class C3a) together with flexible commercial space (Use Class E/Sui Generis) (274 sqm) with associated landscaping, car and cycle parking and associated works following demolition and partial demolition of existing buildings.

Listed building consent was also sought for removal of an existing roof structure between Hope Mill and Ancoats Works, the replacement of existing gates fronting Pollard Street, and associated works in connection with the residential led development of Ancoats Works.

Nine letters of objection, and one letter of support had been received from surrounding residents and businesses within Hope Mill. The objections related to, but were not restricted to, a lack of parking, loss of daylight to local businesses, scale and massing, loss of heritage assets and a lack of S106 contribution.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report and late representations received.

An objector attended and addressed the Committee on the application, raising concerns in relation to the size of the development and the impact it would have on the local community. It was stated that the application would remove a local historic landmark and the proposed development had non-descript features. Concern was also raised in relation to size of the development and associated loss of daylight to existing residents and the impact the development would have on the local infrastructure, including increased traffic that the proposed development would have.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee, advising that the proposals would be respectful of nearby listed buildings to ensure heritage assets in the area remained dominant. It was stated that the proposed development met and exceeded design standards and would result in £35m investment into the local economy. Significant mitigation would be undertaken to protect existing commercial

businesses that neighboured the site and extensive landscaping would also take place, proving attractive, safe communal areas for residents

Councillor Good (Ward Councillor Ancoats and Beswick) attended and addressed the Committee. He raised concerns about the lack of affordable housing in the development. The development proposed 193 units with non being affordable, which did not accord with the Council's policy around affordable housing

Further, he raised concerns that there was no proposed parking provision and he also felt that the sustainable transport element was not sufficient as there was little connected cycle infrastructure to the development.

He requested that the Committee rejected the planning application in its current form. He stated that to meet Council policy the application should at a minimum provide 20% affordable housing units, or the applicant contributed made an equivalent financial contribution (20%) for off-site affordable housing.

The Planning Officer provided clarification on the issues raised by the objector. He stated that the application was not a large development compared to surrounding developments and that the area needed to change as the impact of growth of the city centre continued to move outwards. He advised that the site was unappealing in its current form and contributed little to the area. In relation to affordable housing, he assured the Committee that the Council rigorously tested the viability assessments to all housing development proposals. The profit margin for the development was 17.5% and regardless of what this equated to in monetary terms, Government had set a minimum profit margin of 20% on site, therefore the Council wasn't able to secure a Section 106 Agreement that gave a financial contribution upfront. There would however, a clawback mechanism put in place.

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

Councillor Lovecy addressed the Committee and sought clarity as to whether the conditions attached do the application would ensure that all of the properties would be effective against becoming AirB&B type usage. She also sought confirmation as to who would have access to the new proposed public realm and what steps were being taken in relation to acoustic and noise mitigation

The Planning Officer advised that the conditions attached to the application would protect against the properties being used as AirB&B. He confirmed that the proposed public realm would be for residents only and acknowledged that the issue around acoustics had been challenging and work had been undertaken to ensure those neighbouring businesses could still operate

Councillor Curley enquired as to whether there was any opportunity for additional disabled parking provision and what mechanism was being used to exclude residents in this develop from having to apply and purchase parking permits from the existing scheme.

The Planning Officer advised that a condition could be included to review additional disabled parking if the Committee was minded to agree this. He added that Officers were working with the City Solicitor to identify a mechanism that would exclude residents in this development from applying for a parking permit. This could not be achieved through a Section 106 Agreement but possible a Section 111 Agreement.

Councillor Andrews proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to the completion of the legal agreement associated with planning application 133324/FO/2022 and the inclusion of a condition to review additional disabled parking provision.

Councillor Curley seconded Councillor Andrew's proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application subject to the completion of the legal agreement associated with planning application 133324/FO/2022 and the inclusion of a condition to review additional disabled parking provision.

### **PH/23/38. 135419/FO/2022 - One Medlock Street Manchester M15 5FJ - Deansgate Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the demolition of the existing hotel building and structures and redevelopment of the site to comprise two separate buildings: one 13 storey office building with commercial unit (Use Class E) at ground floor; a part 11, part 38 storey building comprising 1,014 purpose built student accommodation units (sui generis) with ground floor office/community uses (Use Class E, F1 or F2); and associated ancillary internal and external amenity space, hard and soft landscaping and associated highway works.

There had been 11 representations received objecting to the proposed development. The objections related to, but were not restricted to, increased noise and disturbance, scale and massing, over-development, loss of daylight, lack of suitable infrastructure and loss of privacy.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report and late representations received.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. He stated that the site occupied a key location to the southern gateway of the city centre. The application supported the positive change of the wider area as part of the First Street Regeneration Framework. The proposals had been developed through local engagement and working with local teams. The proposed design would provide an improved street level experience, which would be greener and work better for pedestrians and cyclists. The office building proposed would provide over 2200 jobs and there would also be a community hub available for all of the community. The application would also provide high quality purpose built student accommodation for approximately 1000 students. Positive conversation had taken place with

Universities who supported the proposals and would form part of the PBSA pipeline identified by the Council

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

Councillor Lovecy addressed the Committee and sought clarification as to how the affordable low market rent level was set in relation to the proposed student accommodation

The Planning Officer advised that there was no Council policy position for affordable student accommodation but this would be picked up as part of the review of the Council's Core Strategy. It was reported that 20% of the proposed student accommodation would be at 80% of the market rate with equal access to all facilities.

Councillor Curley commented on responses received from Sport England and use of facilities and asked if any provision could be made to address these.

The Planning Officer advised that there was no policy position that required the Council to address the comments received from Sport England.

Councillor Davies welcomed the proposed landscaping and sought clarification as to whether appropriate traffic modelling had been undertaken in connection to safe cycling provision in the area. She also asked if consideration had been given to the potential increase in traffic arising from the use of Uber and online food delivery companies that could be attributed to student accommodation

The Planning Officer confirmed that the Council was looking at an Active Travel Scheme along the whole length of Medlock Street but this was not yet funded. The proposed development would help make a significant improvement to the local environment in terms of tree planting, the widening of pavements and better use of the site. In addition he advised that travel plans had been updated to account for the potential increase use of ridesharing companies and online food delivery companies

Councillor Davies requested the Committee be provided with a note on how travel plans had been updated to account for the potential increase use of ridesharing companies and online food delivery companies

Councillor S Ali proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to a legal agreement for the provision of on-site affordable accommodation, waste management to be provided by a private contractor and a financial contribution towards off site tree planting.

Councillor Kamal seconded Councillor S Ali's proposal.

## **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Is Minded to Approve the application subject to a legal agreement for the provision of on-site affordable accommodation, waste management to be provided by a private contractor and a financial contribution towards off site tree planting.
- (2) Requests a note on how travel plans had been updated to account for the potential increase use of ridesharing companies and online food delivery companies

**PH/23/39. 136170/FO/2023 - Land Bounded By River Street To The North, River Street And Vacant Lane To The East, Hulme Street to The South And Plot 10A Of The First Street Masterplan To The West Manchester - Deansgate Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the erection of a 14-storey building comprising of purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA) (Sui Generis) and ground floor Food Hall (Sui Generis Use), and other associated works including external amenity spaces, public realm, secure cycle parking, access and servicing arrangements (Plot 10B).

No objections had been received.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. He stated that the proposed development had received no objections from local residents, statutory or non-statutory consultees. The development would provide high quality student accommodation to meet the demand in the area from students. It also aligned to the Council's pipeline of further PBSA and would help draw students out of main stream homes, freeing up these properties and reduce rent pressure for the city's residents. The development would also offer 15% of the total accommodation at an affordable rate. The development was also significantly lower in height than that envisaged in the SRF. Designed wise the development would successfully transition from the modern developments of First Street to the traditional mill buildings of Macintosh Village.

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

Councillor Davies addressed the Committee. She welcomed that the proposed development would be sympathetic to the surrounding area. She sought clarification that the proposed 15% of accommodation being at an affordable rate would be for the perpetuity of the development and asked what impact the development would have on traffic in relation to the potential increase in the use of ridesharing companies and online food delivery companies.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the proposed 15% of accommodation at an affordable rate would be required through a Section 106 Agreement and would last for the perpetuity of the development. He also agreed to provide information on how

travel plans had been updated to account for the potential increase use of ridesharing companies and online food delivery companies.

Councillor Kamal proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to a Section 106 to secure affordable student housing and commercial waste disposal.

Councillor Hewitson seconded Councillor Kamal's proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee is Minded to Approve subject to a S106 to secure affordable student housing and commercial waste disposal.

### **PH/23/40. 135834/FO/2022 - Albert Bridge House Bridge Street Manchester M3 5AH - Deansgate Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the creation of a mixed use development comprising two separate components in the form of an office building of up to 19 storeys with ground floor commercial, leisure, food and drink uses (All Use Class E (g)) and/ or drinking establishment (Sui Generis), and, a residential building up to 45 storeys (Use Class C3a) with additional roof top plant, basement car parking, cycle parking, landscaping and public realm, servicing and access arrangements, highway alterations and other associated works following demolition of the existing building complex.

Seven letters of objection and one neutral comment had been received. The objections related to, but were not restricted to, loss of daylight and overbearing, traffic congestion,

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. He stated that the design of the development offered a welcoming and thriving new city centre destinations. The proposed development aligned with the Council's Parsonage Gardens SRF which identified Albert Bridge House as significant redevelopment opportunity for high density commercially led mixed use accommodation. The development would provide approximately 3000 full time jobs and had been designed to deliver best in class, inclusive employment space. The proposed residential accommodation would meet the Home Quality mark standards and the scale and massing of the buildings had been informed by the SRF with consideration to local heritage assets.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer. The development would support the ongoing economic regeneration of the area and form a key part of the city's blue and green infrastructure, providing a 20% biodiversity net gain

Councillor Davies addressed the Committee. She welcomed the success of the Tree Preservation Orders but raised concern in relation to the percentage of parking spaces proposed. She sought clarification as to whether there had been a decision as to whether all the proposed residential accommodation would be for rent or would some be for purchase and whether the proposed ground floor independent retail proposals could be guaranteed as these types of businesses could not often commit to long term leases.

The Planning Officer clarified that there were 12 accessible spaces overall, but if Committee was minded, a condition could be included to review this provision. It was confirmed that all of the proposed residential accommodation would either be for rent or purchase and insofar as the ground floor retail proposals, the applicant would be offering a profit rent or turnover rent to ensure an independent business occupied the space. If not already within the conditions, the Planning Officer proposed a suitable condition could be included in the application

Councillor S Ali proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement in relation to a future review of the affordable housing position, to secure monies associated with highway improvement works along Bridge Street and secure the retention of the project architect and the inclusion of conditions to review the overall provision of residential parking spaces and the rental arrangements for the proposed independent ground floor retail offering.

Councillor Hewitson seconded Councillor S Ali's proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application, subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement in relation to a future review of the affordable housing position, to secure monies associated with highway improvement works along Bridge Street and secure the retention of the project architect and the inclusion of conditions to review the overall provision of residential parking spaces and the rental arrangements for the proposed independent ground floor retail offering.

### **PH/23/41. 136551/FO/2023 - 393 Wilmslow Road Manchester M20 4WA - Withington Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the retention of use of former Hotel (C1) as Temporary Living Accommodation for Single Homeless People (Sui Generis). The applicant proposed to retain the use of the property as short term residential accommodation providing 30 en-suite rooms to single homeless people.

Objections had been received from 24 local residents, Fallowfield Community Guardians and South East Fallowfield Residents Group.

Councillors Wills, Gartside and Chambers had indicated their support for the proposal in principle, subject to consideration of the issues and the attachment of appropriate conditions, as did Withington Civic Society.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the printed report.

An objector attended and addressed the Committee on the application. She stated that she had requested Planning Officers to defer consideration of this application to enable a more in-depth review as to whether the area was the most suitable location to deliver the type of accommodation being proposed. She stated that there was already 12 supported living units within 200 meters of the proposed development and only 21 properties had been consulted on this planning application, all of them bar two, housed mostly students and at least two of them were other supported living accommodation. She felt that more information was needed in relation to police and ambulance call outs in connection with the existing supported living premises in the area before an informed decision could be made. There was also concern about the additional pressures that this development would place on the local infrastructure, such as access to GP surgeries.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. He stated that the applicant had worked in partnership with the Council's homelessness department since March 2020, which had worked very well and wished for this to continue. The site had previously been utilised as nursing home and more recently as a hotel use. The property was currently set up to provide 24 hour support to all residents to help those seeking permanent accommodation. There was a good relationship with direct neighbours and residents. Security staff were on site 24 hours a day seven days a week. The concerns raised by local neighbours were acknowledged and the applicant would seek to minimise any impact. The application would also help reduce the use of emergency temporary accommodation, such as Bed and Breakfast accommodation.

The Planning Officer responded to issues raised by the objector. He advised the Committee that the notification process had gone beyond the Council's statutory requirements and comments received had been taken into account. He added that it was important for the Committee to assess the application on its individual merits and land use planning issues. The existing use of the premises was as a hotel with 30 beds which could be used to home homeless people without the need for planning permission and it was the care package and management facilities to support the occupiers meant that planning permission was now required. The Officer also stated that comings and goings associated with the proposed use would be very similar to a 30 bed hotel but the hotel could also be used for multiple occupancy in each room. As part of the conditions, there would be a requirement for a management regime to be in place which would require the premises to be staffed at all times and occupation would be by referral only.

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

Councillor Lovecy addressed the Committee. She commented that in its current designation the situation could be worse for local residents and felt that with the information provided to the Committee, Members were in a position to make a decision on the application before them.

Councillor Curley leant his support to the application and requested that Officers ensured that a strong management team was put in place to manage the facility. In addition, Councillor Davies sought clarification as to whether there was any condition that could be put in place to ensure the applicant worked closely with the Council's Homelessness team.

The Director of Planning and Building Control advised that there was already a strong relationship between the Council's Homelessness Department and the Operator of the premises and agreed to feedback the Committee's views to officers within the Council's Homelessness Department.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there was a condition in place for a management plan to be submitted and agreed which would include occupancy, arrangements for staffing and accommodation referrals, timings for moving in and out and contracts between occupants and the operator.

Councillor Lovecy asked if it was possible to strengthen this existing condition.

The Director of Director of Planning and Building Control proposed that, if minded, the Committee could approve the application subject to her being able to have discussions with colleagues Homelessness as to how best to strengthen this condition and the subsequently approve the application in consultation with Chair

Councillor Kamal proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor S Ali seconded Councillor Kamal's proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application as set out in the report, subject to the Director of Planning and Building Control discussing with colleagues in the Council's Homelessness Department as to how best to strengthen the condition for a suitable management plan.

*(Councillor Gartside declared an interest in this application as she had fettered her discretion by making her views known as part of the consultation with Ward Councillors. She left the meeting during consideration of the application).*

### **PH/23/42. 135647/FO/2022 - 550 Mauldeth Road West Manchester M21 7AA - Chorlton Park Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the erection of a new Lidl foodstore (Use Class E) with associated car parking and landscaping.

This application was deferred at the meeting of the Committee held on 16 March 2023; where the Committee resolved to be 'minded to refuse' the proposal and requested that Officers bring a report to a future meeting to address their concerns.

which related to highways safety and specifically to traffic management and the impact that this would have on pedestrian and cycle users of the area.

In response to issues raised at the previous meeting, additional information had been submitted by the applicant in order to further address these concerns. The Planning Officer provided a brief outline of the additional measures proposed and advise that both the Council's Highways department and Transport for Greater Manchester were satisfied with what was now being proposed and would add an additional layer of safety for all users of the highway and footway. On this basis, Planning Officers could not provide appropriate planning grounds for refusal.

An objector attended and addressed the Committee on the application. She raised concerns that the amendments to the highways safety had not and could not make the site suitable for a large supermarket. The proposed development was in the middle of a four school campus and would have an adverse impact on pedestrian and child safety as well as an increase in traffic within the locality. It was felt that the updated highway safety proposals still did not mitigate the concerns already raised. The proposed development was expected to increase traffic by up to 300 cars per hour at peak times and it was felt that the new proposals still did not address the concerns raised by the Committee when it first considered the application.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. He stated that the original application had been amended following concerns raised around highways safety. The measures now proposed were in addition to existing safety measures proposed. The applicant was also willing to review traffic patterns in the first three months of operation by way of a condition with a view to ensure it operated in a safe and appropriate manner. He commented that the Council's Highways Department and Transport for Greater Manchester were now satisfied with the additional safety proposals. As previously presented the development would deliver a significant number of tangible benefits to the local community.

Councillor Midgley (Ward Councillor Chorlton Park) state that whilst she recognised the different views on the application from local residents, in her view the additional highways safety mitigations now addressed concerns previously raised. If approved, she hoped the applicant would work with the local community to ensure they were responsible and responsive neighbours.

The Planning Officer reminded the Committee that the current office building on the site provided 105 car parking spaces that could be brought back into use or changed under to retail units under permitted development without the need for the proposed highway safety measures now being proposed, which was a material consideration.

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

Councillor Hughes addressed the Committee. He sought confirmation that the Council's Highways Department were now satisfied with the safety proposals that had been put forward.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the Highways Department was satisfied with the safety measure now being proposed.

Councillor Andrews proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor S Ali seconded Councillor Andrews's proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee approves the application as set out in the report.

### **PH/23/43. 135936/FO/2023 - Bignor Street Park Heywood Park Manchester - Cheetham Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the erection of part single, part two storey building to form purpose-built primary school (Class F1) with associated open space, access, landscaping, boundary treatment and other infrastructure works.

The proposals were subject to notification by way of 395 letters to nearby addresses, a site notice was posted at the site and an advertisement placed in the Manchester Evening News. In response to the neighbour notification four comments were received, two objections to the proposals, one comment in support and one neutral comment.

The Planning Officer advised that the mitigation measures proposed by the applicant following comments received from Sport England, now resulted in the recommendation of the Director of Planning and Building Control being altered to Minded to Approve, subject to the signature of an appropriate legal agreement and conditions, and the signing of a Section 106 agreement securing offsite mitigation for re-provision of play. As such, the application would no longer be required to be referred to the Secretary of State.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. She stated that the proposal would contribute to additional primary school places in the city. The proposed mitigation package addresses the loss of the playing field on site. There would be no significant on the highways network and the proposed development was in accordance with the relevant policies within the Council's Development Plan.

The Planning Officer clarified that in the late representations received, condition 33 was to be removed as this was a repetition of condition 32 and a slight amendment to the wording of condition 4 was also required.

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

Councillor Riasat addressed the Committee, stating that he welcomed the securing of the Section 106 Agreement and was in full support of the application now that all concerns had been addressed. He proposed a motion to approve the officer's

recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement securing offsite mitigation for reprovision of play and the deletion of condition 33 and rewording of condition 4 as outlined by Officers.

Councillor Andrews seconded Councillor Riasat's proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application, subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement securing offsite mitigation for reprovision of play and the deletion of condition 33 and rewording of condition 4 as outlined by Officers.

*(Councillors S Ali and Hassan declared interests in this application as they had fettered their discretion by having a pre meeting with the applicant at which they made their views on the application known. They left the meeting during consideration of the application).*

### **PH/23/44. 135576/FO/2022 - 88-90 Carmoor Road Manchester M13 0FB - Ardwick Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the demolition of a number of existing buildings, the erection of part three storey, part six storey purpose-built student accommodation (sui generis) with 172 beds in a mix of studio and cluster units, together with ancillary facilities, shared amenity space, site access and other associated works following demolition of existing buildings.

130 representations had been received, 129 of which objected to the proposed development, along with a third-party objection on behalf of Afro Caribbean and Friends Community Association (ACFCA). A further letter of objection had been received from a patron of the community centre following the submission of revised details and a further period of re-notification.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the printed report.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. She stated that the development would deliver high quality student accommodation and already had over 10,000 student beds under its management across the UK. The applicant had met with a number of community representatives and as a result of these discussion he proposed scheme had been significantly reduced to mitigate the impact on the local community centre. The site had been identified as part of the Council future student accommodation pipeline and would be of a high quality design protected by secure access and 24 hour site management. A travel plan commitment to sustainable travel had also been made by the applicant. The development would also look to provide 20% of all bed spaces being advertised below market rent level in each academic year.

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

Councillor Andrews proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to a legal agreement containing affordable rent obligations for up to 20% of all bed spaces being advertised as being below market rent level in each academic year.

Councillor Kamal seconded Councillor Andrew's proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application, subject to a legal agreement containing affordable rent obligations for up to 20% of all bed spaces being advertised as being below market rent level in each academic year.

*(Councillor Hewitson declared an interest in this application as she had fettered her discretion by having a pre meeting with the applicant at which she made her views on the application known. She left the meeting during consideration of the application).*