

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 13 February 2020

Present: Councillor Curley (Chair)

Councillors: Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Hitchen, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Madeleine Monaghan, Watson and White

Apologies: Councillor Riasat

Also present: Councillors: Akbar, Ahmed Ali, Kilpatrick, Newman, O'Neil and Wright

PH/20/11. Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications, since the agenda was issued, was circulated.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/20/12. Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 19 December 2019 as a correct record.

PH/20/13. 124820/FO/2019 - Land to the north east of Enterprise Way bounded by Roxholme Walk and Dentdale Walk and the rear of Lincombe Road and Felskirk Road to the north, Manchester M22 1PU

(Councillors Andrews and Flanagan both declared prejudicial interests in this item of business and left the meeting before it was considered)

The application related to the construction of a temporary 729 space car park, with associated access arrangements onto Enterprise Way, for a temporary period of five years. The application was deferred at the meeting of the Committee on 16 January 2020 for a site visit to be undertaken to allow members of the committee to view the site of the proposed development and surrounding area that were not available on the drawings and images included in the planning report submitted; due to the loss of employment land and the greenness of the site. The Committee undertook a site visit prior to the meeting.

The proposals are for car parking to be brought forward as an early phase of development to support the applicant's growth at existing office space at the Airport and in advance of their Headquarter offices being developed. The proposals would not result in the loss of employment land but would bring forward the site as an earlier phase of development that is associated with a scheme granted planning

permission by Committee at its meeting held in December 2018. It was explained that the proposal was not related to the operation of the airport but to the growth of a business located near to the airport.

The meeting was addressed by an objector who referred to the Climate Emergency that the Council has declared. He argued that the demand for ever more car parking capacity had to stop if there was to be a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions in the city. This application was an opportunity for the Council to show how travel to work needed to be reconsidered in the future. The application should be rejected and green travel options relied upon.

The meeting was then addressed by a representative of the applicant. He spoke of the applicant's investment in creating new jobs in Manchester and how the growth of the business was a boon to the city's economy and the economic wellbeing of the area.

Councillor O'Neil addressed the meeting as a ward councillor for the Woodhouse Park ward. He felt that the traffic generated from the operation of the airport was already adding to the pollution and carbon dioxide that were directly affecting the local communities, and that this application would only exacerbate that undesirable situation. He called on the committee to reject the application.

Councillor Newman also addressed the meeting as a ward councillor for the Woodhouse Park ward. He spoke of the levels of pollution that local residents face from the airport operations and the traffic generated by air passengers going to and from by the airport. This application would add to pollution and traffic in the area. The employment opportunities generated by the growth of the business were welcome but he sought an assurance that the jobs created would be taken up by local residents so that they did not result in more traffic.

The planning officer confirmed that the principle of a large car park at this site had been approved in a 2018 planning approval that had also dealt with the building of new offices for the company. This application was bringing forward the timing of the implementation of a part of that earlier consent. The applicant had provided a Green Travel Plan as part of the application to help reduce the level of additional traffic the expansion of the car park would generate, as the number of spaces available would still be fewer than the number of employees who were to be working at the site.

The Chair referred to investment into community and social infrastructure by the company to support community initiatives in the Woodhouse Park ward.

Given the relationship of the proposed car park to the delivery of the consent granted in 2018, it was proposed that approval of this application should be time-limited as the future of the whole site needed to be in accordance with the earlier consent. The long-term operation of the car park should not be independent of the proposed office development. The recommendation had approval for five years only. The Committee felt that two years would be more appropriate. It was proposed and agreed that a temporary consent of two years should be given.

Decision

To grant temporary consent for a period of two years subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the Planning Officer's report.

PH/20/14. 125474/FO/2019 - Land Adjacent to Mayton Street, Manchester, M11 2AN - Clayton & Openshaw Ward

(Councillor Andrews re-joined the meeting for consideration of this application. Councillor Hitchen had to leave the meeting for part of this item and so took no part in the decision making)

The application submitted related to the erection of twenty three two storey dwelling houses with associated car parking, hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatments.

The application site comprises of land previously developed for housing that has been maintained as open green space. It is intersected by a network of footpaths with incidental mature tree planting and surrounded highways along Beede Street, Mayton Street, Herne Street, Newtown Close and Thames Close, which also provide access to neighbouring housing and communal on street car parking bays. The surrounding area mainly comprises of two storey pitched roof terraced housing with semi-detached houses located to the north of the site along Mayton Street and Beede Street. A mix of single, two and three storey houses and apartments are located to the south of the site.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further information on representations made and proposed further conditions that should be applied to any consent.

The meeting was addressed by a representative of the applicant. She said that the development would bring 23 much-needed high quality affordable family houses to Openshaw, with 17 for social rent and 6 for shared-ownership. The number of homes being proposed had been reduced from 39 to 23 so as to retain an area of open space as a community resource, preserving something that the community has been enjoying for some years.

The Committee welcomed the scheme and the contribution it was going to make to the provision of affordable homes in the city.

Decision

Minded to approve subject the conditions and reasons set out in the report and the further conditions and reasons proposed in the Late Representations, and also subject to entering into a Section106 Agreement to secure a retained contribution of affordable housing as part of the authorised development, the Environment Agency being satisfied with the additional flood risk information and no adverse comments being received from the Coal Authority.

PH/20/15. 124972/FO/2019 and 125248/FO/2019 - Land bounded by Mayfield Depot Building, Hoyle Street, Mancunian Way (A635), Baring Street, Buxton Street and Berry Street (inclusive) and McDonald Hotel along with associated roads and junctions and land adjacent to Mancunian Way (Former Mayfield Goods Yard), Baring Street Office 2, Manchester, M1 2AD - Piccadilly Ward

(Councillor Flanagan re-joined the meeting for consideration of this application)

The application 124972/FO/2019 was for the phased creation of around 2.4 ha (6 acres) of public park, including hard and soft landscaping and new bridges across the River Medlock; erection of 9 storey office development above basement with mezzanine and plant level (Class B1) with ground floor Class A1 (Shop), A2 (Financial and Professional Services), A3 (Café and Restaurant), A4 (Drinking Establishment) B1 (Office) uses, rooftop amenity spaces and terrace levels, associated public realm and riverside walkway; erection of an eleven storey Multi-Storey Car Park to provide 581 car parking spaces with associated landscaping; highways and infrastructure works including the creation of new junction from London Road to provide access to the multi-storey car park (MSCP) (Use Class Sui Generis); works to Baring Street, stopping up of Bond Street and Nether Street (alongside associated Traffic Regulation Orders to manage unrestricted parking to Buxton Street, Berry Street and Travis Street (to be delivered and implemented prior to the MSCP becoming operational)) alongside enabling works comprising phased demolition and site clearance, earthworks including re-profiling and construction of retaining walls for the land bounded by the Mancunian Way to the south, Mayfield Depot to the north, Baring Street to the west and Hoyle Street to the east. The site is located on Land bounded by Mayfield Depot Building, Hoyle Street, Mancunian Way (A635), Baring Street, Buxton Street & Berry Street (inclusive) and McDonald Hotel Along with associated Roads and Junctions, Manchester, M1 2AD.

The application 125248/FO/2019 was for the Erection of a thirteen storey building (including ground and mezzanine) comprising office space (Use Class B1) above flexible uses at ground and mezzanine levels (Class A1 (Shop), A2 (Financial and Professional Services), A3 (Café and Restaurant), A4 (Drinking Establishment), /D1 (Art Gallery, Museum and Conference & Training Centre)/D2 (Cinema)/ Theatre (Sui Generis)) with rooftop amenity spaces and external terrace levels, internal ancillary storage spaces for waste, cycles, rooftop plant, back of house functions and associated landscaping works. The site is located on land adjacent to Mancunian Way (former Mayfield Goods Yard), Baring Street Office 2, Manchester, M1 2AD.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted for application 124972/FO/2019 which provided further information on representations made.

The meeting was addressed by a representative of the applicant. He explained that at the heart of this application was the creation of a new public park in Manchester, with a river running through it. The park was felt to be an essential element of the application that would see the world-class regeneration of the mostly derelict Mayfield site, in accordance with the Mayfield Strategic Regeneration Framework. This new district would create a community in the city with a mix of employment, shopping,

leisure and homes. It would result in up to 10,000 new jobs. The historic depot at Mayfield was to be retained and restored as part of the scheme.

The committee welcomed the application for the redevelopment of this important area at the edge of the city centre, and the transformation that it would bring about. They discussed the objections that had been made and the extent of the car parking that was being proposed.

Decision

To approve both applications subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report.

PH/20/16. 124302/FO/2019 - Land bounded by Chester Road, Hulme Hall Road and Ellesmere Street, Manchester, M15 4JY - Hulme Ward

The application was for the demolition of the existing building on site and the erection of a residential-led mixed use development within two build blocks ranging from eight to eighteen storeys in height. The development consists of three hundred and sixty-six residential units (C3); two hundred and seventeen square metres of commercial floor space (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, B1 or D2); associated car and cycle parking within a basement level; public realm and landscaping; access and servicing arrangements and other associated works.

The site is located on the north east side of the junction of Chester Road and Hulme Hall Road, and is within the St Georges area of Hulme. It is bounded by Hulme Hall Road, Chester Road and Ellesmere Street. It adjoins Sky Gardens, a new build residential scheme on Chester Road and Phoenix House, a 1960s industrial building on Ellesmere Street. The site is rectangular in shape and 0.38 hectares. There is a vacant light industrial unit on part of the site with the remainder used as a temporary site office and car parking and is bounded by a security fence.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further information on representations made. Additional photographic images of the development site were circulated. A representation had been made that the Committee undertake a site visit.

Decision

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

PH/20/17. 125654/FO/2019 - Former Church Inn, 84 Cambridge Street, Manchester, M15 6BP - Hulme Ward

The application was for the erection of a nine-storey purpose built student accommodation building comprising sixty-two units and associated landscape and highway works, following demolition of existing structures.

The site is located on the west side of Cambridge Street, Hulme, just north of the junction with Cavendish Street and to the south of the Mancunian Way. The site is viewed in the context of the Mancunian Way and Manchester City Centre when approaching Manchester from the south. The site measures 0.3 hectares comprises a vacant public house known as the Church Inn, the public house closed in March 2016. The site is bounded by student accommodation blocks immediately to the north (Cambridge House) and south (Manchester House), Cambridge Street to the east with Manchester Metropolitan University student accommodation and facilities on the opposite side of the street. To the west lies a housing estate managed by One Manchester, the site immediately adjoins the turning head to Bristle Street and lies in close proximity to property on Elmdale Walk and Dalesman Walk.

The Committee had on 14 March 2019 resolved to defer determination of an application in order to undertake a site visit before making a decision. The site visit took place on 11 April 2019, and the Committee were minded to refuse the application due to concerns expressed regarding the negative impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties resulting in a loss of amenity, overlooking and reduction in daylight. The application was deferred and the Director of Planning asked to bring a report which addresses the concerns raised and potential reasons for refusal. The applicant reviewed the scheme to address the concerns expressed by the Planning and Highways Committee and revised plans had been submitted in June 2019.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further information on representations and objections made. It also proposed a further condition that should be attached to a consent. Objections received referred to the negative impact of the development on residential amenity and the loss of green space. The applicant's late representations included copies of correspondence with two local councillors saying that those councillors no longer opposed the application.

A local resident spoke at the meeting to object to the application. He referred to the guidelines relating to loss of daylight and sunlight and asserted that the report showed there would be 152 transgressions of those guidelines if the scheme was built. He referred to the extent that the glazing of the building would result in the potential overlooking of the windows and gardens of adjacent properties, some at short distances. The development would also require access over land that was in other ownership, and permission for that had not been sought. Providing that access would result in the loss of an amenity space enjoyed by the existing residents of neighbouring properties. The access to the site was constrained and unable to deal with the likely traffic volumes or provide sufficient access for emergency vehicles.

The meeting was addressed by a representative of the applicant. He explained that this application was the developer's first scheme of student accommodation in Manchester, although they had much experience from other universities across the UK. Their approach is to work in partnership with universities, local council and other local community stakeholders to ensure that their student accommodation developments are rooted in the communities. He explained how the proposals had been changed since they were considered in 2019 so as to address the concerns that the committee had raised at that time. The scale of the development had been

reduced, bringing about improvements in the daylight and sunlight available to occupants. The development was supported by the university and two of the ward councillors.

The meeting was next addressed by Councillor Wright, a ward councillor for the Hulme ward. She said that the building was still too big for the proposed location, out of keeping with the neighbouring properties and would result in significant detriment to the residents of the neighbouring properties. She referred to the extent of the objections to the scheme from local people. She spoke of the unsatisfactory proposals for access and for the servicing and removal of waste, and where the bins for the building were to be sited. He asked the Committee to reject the application.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the applicant was negotiating with the other land owner to secure the necessary access to the rear of the building, but that the right of access over the land was primarily a legal matter for the applicant. Good access to the building and the servicing of the bins were to be addressed by the conditions being proposed. He confirmed that in planning terms the loss of daylight within this building, and to one of the adjacent buildings, was considered to be acceptable as the guidelines were intended to be used in a flexible manner.

The Committee referred to the size and massing of the proposed development and the impact it would have on the amenity of the neighbouring properties, as well as the concerns about how access to the rear was to be arranged, together with the proposals for waste management at the rear of the building. Members were also concerned by the suggestion that students did not need to enjoy the same levels of daylight as residents in other types of properties. Members also felt that there could be significant traffic generated at certain times of the day, if the experiences from other buildings in the city centre were replicated here.

Decision

Minded to refuse for the reasons due to the negative impact of the proposed development on the character of the area by virtue of the height of the development proposal, the impact upon residential amenity with regards to the development proposals having an overbearing impact that would result in a loss of light to neighbouring property and with regards to the impact of deliveries, servicing and noise disturbance having an impact upon residential amenity.

PH/20/18. 117960/FO/2017 - High Elms, Upper Park Road, Manchester, M14 5RU - Rusholme Ward

The Committee was informed that the application had been withdrawn by the applicant.

PH/20/19. 117961/LO/2017 - High Elms, Upper Park Road, Manchester, M14 5RU - Rusholme Ward

The Committee was informed that the application had been withdrawn by the applicant.

**PH/20/20. 123188/FO/2019 - Xaverian College Lower Park Road Manchester
M14 5RB - Rusholme Ward**

(Having been out of the room at the start of this item of business Councillor N Ali took no part in the decision making, Councillor M Monaghan was also not present for this item of business)

The application was for the Installation of fencing and gates to campus boundaries between 2.4 m and 2.7 metres in height. The application proposals relate to the boundary walls around the Xaverian College campus which is located in the Rusholme ward of Manchester. The College occupies a mix of new and converted buildings focused around an open area green space, however the Campus is spread over two distinct areas to the east and west of Lower Park Road. Many of the older buildings on the Campus are former residential villas which have been converted and extended to accommodate educational use. The campus is located within Victoria Park Conservation Area and contains the Grade II listed buildings known as Ward Hall, Marylands and Firwood which have all been converted for educational use in the past.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further information on representations made. A further eleven objections had been received including from the Manchester Civic Society relating to the height and design of gates and railings, preservation of trees, loss of visual amenity.

The meeting was addressed by a representative of Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society who spoke about the possible impact the development would have on the Conservation Area. She spoke of the college's strategy to use high fences to help safeguard the learners, to give the college more time to respond to any risks to the students. She felt that as the strategy was untested, with no proof that all the measures the college was seeking were actually necessary. It was likely that the fencing would not need to be as high as that which is being proposed, making reference to the boundary walls that have been at the site. The proposed heights were excessive in the Conservation Area and a better design could actually enhance the area and not harm it.

Councillor Ali, a ward councillor for Rusholme ward, addressed the meeting. He spoke of the importance of the college and its heritage buildings to the character of the Conservation Area and the Victoria Park neighbourhood. He urged the college to consider using railings of 2.1m high rather than 2.4m in the more prominent parts of the boundary.

A representative of the applicant spoke next. He referred to the desire to maintain the aesthetic qualities of the college and the desire to avoid proposals that would harm the college's estate and the wider Conservation Area. Nevertheless, the college was trying to adhere to the Department of Education advised minimum height of 2.4m on the site boundary.

The department's advisory minimum height was confirmed by the Planning Officer.

Members of the committee welcomed the way that the college had been working with the local community and the Civic Society to try to avoid harming the amenity of the area and expressed their desire that the cooperative approach continued into the future. The members accepted the college's desire to comply with the Department of Education's advisory height and welcomed the quality of the design that the college was proposing to use.

Decision

To approve both applications subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report.

PH/20/21. 125186/FO/2019 - Riverside Lodge, 208 Palatine Road, Manchester, M20 2WF - Didsbury West Ward

(Councillor S Ali left the meeting part way through this item of business and took no part in the decision on this or the later item)

The application was for Rooftop extension to Block A to form 4 x 2 bedroom apartments and provision of an additional 5 car parking spaces. Riverside Lodge is residential complex on Palatine Road consisting of 34 flats split into two blocks. Block A is 4 storeys in height (flat nos. 1 to 16), while block B is a part 4/part 5 storey building housing flat nos. 17-34. The ground floor levels of both buildings are elevated as they sit on top of undercroft parking facilities for 34 cars. To the front of the blocks is a hard surfaced area used for servicing and parking, while at the rear there is a communal lawned area.

To the west of the site is a wooded area and beyond that stands the Green Belt. To the east of the site, on the opposite side of Palatine Road, stands a modern residential development set behind a Site of Biological Interest. To the north of Block B is another strip of woodland, beyond which stands three detached dwelling houses. Riverside Court, a 3 storey residential complex of 24 flats lies to the south of Block A. The row of trees along the rear boundary of the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order and the site is located within Flood Zone 3.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further information and further objections that had been received from the local MP and local residents, and a further condition that was being recommended to any approval.

A local resident spoke as a representative of the owners of properties in Riverside Lodge. The application was a resubmission of a scheme that had been approved in 2014 but had lapsed before it had been commenced. However, the policy issues now raised by the application had changed since the prior approval had been given. She commented on the lack of provisions for cycle storage, and also to the loss of daylight and sunlight to some of the residents in the blocks within the overall scheme. There would also be a loss of green space and a likelihood that local parking problems would be exacerbated.

Councillor Kilpatrick, a ward councillor for the Didsbury West ward addressed the meeting. He felt that the original consent should never had been given. He explained the setting of Riverside Lodge as an established site of two blocks close to the River Mersey. He described the loss of amenity that the approval would result in to the residents of Riverside Court and Riverside Lodge, highlighting the parking problems that will arise in the neighbourhood. He added that some of the proposed new parking was in an area that is at risk of flooding. He explained why he felt that application was contrary to the Council's policy on housing development outside of district centres. He asked the committee to reject the application.

The Planning Officer explained that the loss of daylight and sunlight had been considered and the development would result in only one of the neighbouring dwellings being below the guideline levels.

The members of the committee considered the merits of the application and were concerned about the potential harm to the character of the area due to the proposed car parking. They weighed up the extent of change in the scheme, and the guidance that might be relevant since the approval had been given in 2014. There were also concerns about the impact on residents during the construction period including the loss of the existing lift for a period of time.

Decision

Minded to refuse due to the harm the development would cause to the amenity of existing residents, the loss of green space in order to provide additional car parking, and the disruption to existing residents during the construction period, including the loss of the lift in the building for a period of time.

PH/20/22. 125299/FO/2019 - Hologic (Warehouse Building), Crewe Road, Manchester, M23 9HZ - Brooklands Ward

The application relates to the erection of a 3 storey extension to provide new loading bay and storage area, with ancillary office accommodation on a mezzanine level with associated vehicle turning area. The proposed site on Crewe Road consists of two buildings: a two storey office and research facility and a packaging/ warehouse and office facility. The applicant also utilises an element of the building located on the opposite side of Crewe Road for storage. The application proposes to plant a landscaping screen, including 13 semi-mature trees, along the boundary with nos. 271 and 271a Wythenshawe Road.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representations that had been submitted by the applicant which provided further information and a further condition that was being recommended to any approval.

A representative of the applicant addressed the committee. The application was for a warehouse on an industrial estate. This would result in the creation of local employment and help reduce carbon emissions by bring manufacture and distribution of the company's product into one location instead of being spread across England. He spoke of the mitigations that were part of the application to address concerns about noise and visual impact.

The committee welcomed and supported the application and the contribution it will make to employment and reducing carbon dioxide emissions.

Decision

To approve, subject the conditions and reasons set out in the report and the further condition and reasons proposed in the Late Representations