

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 14 November 2019**

**Present:** Councillor Curley (Chair)

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

**Also present:** Councillors: A Simcock and Shilton-Godwin

#### **PH/19/101 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

##### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/19/102 Minutes**

##### **Decision**

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

#### **PH/19/103 123364/FO/2019 – 15-19 Slade Lane, Manchester, M13 0QJ - Longsight Ward**

The application submitted relates to the erection of two three-storey buildings providing six apartments in each (twelve in total) including two car parking spaces and associated cycle shelter, landscaping and boundary treatments following demolition of existing buildings.

The application site measured 0.15 hectares in area, is of a roughly rectangular shape and is bounded by a functioning railway line to the rear (east), two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouses to the north and a children's day nursery to the south. Opposite the site on the other side of Slade Lane is a church and associated church hall. The site relates to a disused haulage yard which incorporates industrial type outbuildings, including a single storey, double height shed and an inspection pit to the side of 17 Slade Lane, together with a single pair of two-storey, semi-detached, bay fronted residential properties to the southern half of the site at 17-19 Slade Lane.

The Planning Officer did not provide any further updates on the application to the information already submitted to the Committee.

The applicant's representative was present at the meeting and addressed the Committee on the proposed development.

There were no objectors to the application present at the meeting.

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

A member made reference to the Council's affordable housing policy of the properties proposed and why this had not been included within the report.

The Planning Officer reported that the number of units in the development did not meet the threshold of Council's affordable housing policy.

A member referred to consultation with any existing residents neighbouring the site and whether the residents could be included in any ongoing consultation with the constructors such as the construction management plan to help reduce any potential impact during the construction process.

The Planning Officer reported that the properties on the site are in a poor state of repair and not habitable and there is no requirement for the constructors to consult with neighbours on the construction management plan. Liaison with the constructor and officers from Environmental Health and Highways would take place to ensure compliance with the construction management plan. Planning Officers undertook to encourage all constructors to start and maintain a dialogue with local residents before and during the construction process.

A member referred to the density of the proposal, as referred to in Policy H5, in view of the proximity of Longsight District Centre and asked what consideration had been given to that Policy. Officers were also asked what consideration had been given to the arrangements of the bin store for the proposed development.

The Committee was informed that the density of the proposed development was assessed as part of the application process regarding scale, massing, parking and mixture of properties and had met those requirements. The bin store has been designed to be appropriate for the landscaping of the development and to be unobtrusive to the street scene and practical to allow good access for residents.

## **Decision**

The Committee approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted.

### **PH/19/104 124495/FO/2019 – Land at Great Ancoats Street, Manchester, M4 7DB - Ancoats and Beswick Ward**

This application was for the erection of a 12 storey building to create a 212-bedroom hotel (Use Class C1) with ancillary facilities at ground and first floor level and associated servicing, disabled car parking, drop-off area, public realm and hard landscaping works, with access from Pollard Street.

The application site measured 0.11 hectares in a prominent position on Great Ancoats Street. The site is part of a larger area of surface parking and is surrounded

by a timber knee rail and vegetation. Vehicle access to the site is from Pollard Street. The site is bounded by Great Ancoats Street, a 5 storey office building and 7 storey hotel, and apartment buildings ranging from 4 to 8 storeys.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted regarding an update made to Condition 2 of the recommended planning conditions.

The applicant's representative was present at the meeting and addressed the Committee on the proposed development.

There were no objectors to the application present at the meeting.

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

A member in welcoming the application, referred to the arrangements proposed for disabled parking (two spaces had been allocated) and questioned if this was adequate in view of the number of staff to be employed at the hotel and guests who may have a disability and require a disabled parking space.

The Planning Officer reported that the site is located within the city centre and subject to planning policies that seek to promote sustainable means of transport and discourage car usage. The development site is in a central and highly sustainable location within easy access to buses, trams and trains. The Committee was informed that there is a permission on the site for a larger development than that proposed in the application. The application seeks to make the most efficient use of the site with some landscaping included. If required, discussions could be arranged with the proprietor of an adjoining car park site to arrange for additional car parking spaces in addition to the two disabled spaces proposed.

The member, in noting the response, reiterated that point that there is a need for additional disabled parking spaces to those proposed to prevent people with limited mobility from being disenfranchised and on that basis the member would be minded to refuse the application until this issue had been satisfactorily addressed.

Members referred to the need for colour images within the agenda papers for planning applications rather than black and white images provided to help members to better understand the proposal and the surrounding area.

The Planning Officer reported that the images for all planning applications were available in colour on the planning portal accessed through Council's website. Black and white images are used in printed agendas for all Council committees.

The Chair stated that he would speak to the Chief Executive on the use of colour images within reports before the next meeting of the Committee.

A member referred to the information provided within the application and questioned if this was sufficient to make an informed decision on the application.

The Director of Planning stated that the reports submitted to the Committee are written with a sufficient level of information and detail to enable committee members to understand a proposal and make an informed decision.

The members concluded that the application required further consideration to address the concerns raised regarding disabled parking spaces and requested that the Director of Planning bring a further report to the next meeting to address the concerns with potential reasons for refusal.

## **Decision**

The Committee is minded to refuse the application for the reasons that the proposed two disabled parking spaces are not sufficient for the size of the proposed development in view of the number of potential visitors and workforce.

### **PH/19/105 12685/FO/2019 – Land at Hough End Centre and South of Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7SX – Chorlton Park Ward**

The application submitted relates to the construction of a part three storey, part two storey, part single storey building to provide a new secondary school with associated sports facilities and floodlighting, external landscaping, car park, cycle store and access as well as replacement outdoor provision for a police dog training area and police horse paddocks.

The application site measured 4.3 hectares and comprised of a parcel of vacant land formerly used to accommodate a care home that has been demolished and the southern part of the site is currently used by Greater Manchester Police and provides an outdoor police dog training area, horse paddocks and 2 grass sports pitches.

The site is bounded to the north by Mauldeth Road West beyond which lies residential property on Mauldeth Road West, Chelsfield Grove and the junction of Withington Road and Mauldeth Road West. To the east lies the rest of the Greater Manchester Police compound known as The Hough End Centre, Broughton Park Rugby Club and Hough End Playing Fields. To the south west the site is bounded by the Metrolink Line with residential property beyond.

The proposed secondary school would eventually cater to 1200 pupils, aged 11-16, with 120 full time members of staff in a three storey (9424m<sup>2</sup> floor space) new build facility.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted regarding a question raised on the location of the school and the potential impact of Brexit on the need for additional school places. Reference was also made to the rewording of Condition 28, in the event that foxes were found to be on the development site.

There were no objectors to the application present at the meeting.

Councillor Shilton-Godwin attended the meeting and addressed the Committee on the application on behalf of Chorlton Park ward councillors. Reference was made to concerns raised on the site of the proposed high school and the travel arrangements of pupils to get to the school and the other high schools located in the area. This would result in a high number of journeys each day by pupils to and from the school. The Chorlton Park ward councillors welcomed the building of a new school and were satisfied with planning officer responses to the concerns they had raised. The committee was informed that the ward councillors would continue to work with officers on the application.

The applicant's representative was present at the meeting and addressed the Committee on the proposed development.

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

A member referred to the travel plan arrangements proposed and asked for clarification of the number of drop off bays proposed and the controls to be introduced to prevent and discourage drop off on Mauldeth Road West.

The planning officer reported that there were 24 drop off bays proposed and there would be a further 18 visitor and additional mini bus spaces that could also be used for drop offs. A programme of traffic controls and other measures would be introduced on Mauldeth Road West, including traffic regulation orders, to prevent and discourage vehicles from stopping on the road and mounting the pavement. In addition, a shared pedestrian cycleway would be introduced to the south of Mauldeth Road West between Princess Road and the Metrolink bridge.

## **Decision**

The Committee approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report and supplementary information submitted.

[Councillor Flanagan was not present for the consideration and when the vote on this application took place.]

## **PH/19/106 121320/FH/2019 - 53 Kingston Road Manchester M20 2SB - Didsbury East Ward**

The application was for a retrospective application for the reconstruction of external brick work to front and side elevations of a dwelling. The application was submitted to the Planning and Highways Committee on 19 September 2019 where the Committee decided to undertake a site visit. The application was submitted to the Committee on 17 October 2019 where the applicant requested that the application be deferred in order to allow for a sample panel of the brick tinting to be prepared.

The property at 53 Kingston Road is a 2 storey detached dwellinghouse located within the Didsbury St James Conservation Area. 53 Kingston Road is one of seven identical detached dwellings (the *Shirley Houses*), located on the eastern side of

Kingston Road, which were constructed as accommodation for staff by the Shirley Institute, now Towers Business Park.

The property sits in spacious grounds, beyond which to the north and south are properties 47 and 55 Kingston Road respectively, both properties are two storey detached dwellings. To the east of the site there is a thick landscape belt running along the common boundary with The Towers Business Park. To the west of the site, on the opposite side of Kingston Road, stands no. 56 Kingston Road, a part single/part 2 storey detached dwelling.

Planning permission to erect a two storey rear extension and a single storey side extension to the property was approved in January 2018 under reference 117633/FH/2017. The planning permission was conditional upon using matching bricks in the construction of the extensions in order to maintain the uniform look of the *Shirley Houses*. It became apparent during the construction of the extensions that the approved brick (Ibstock Birtley Olde English) had not been used. Furthermore, for structural reasons the applicant removed the outer skin of the front elevation and completely rebuilt the side elevations using instead a Weathered Pre-War Common type brick.

In view of the use of the non-matching bricks and the fact the rebuilding work was undertaken while the extensions approved under planning approval 117633/FH/2017 were being constructed, the applicant was informed of the need to apply for the rebuilding of the front and side elevations and this formed the basis of the application submitted. In addition to applying to retain these rebuilt elevations, the applicant also proposed to colour tint the bricks to match the other remaining *Shirley Houses*. While not part of this proposal the applicant would also be colour tinting the extensions approved under planning permission 117633/FH/2017 to ensure that all the new brick work matches the other *Shirley Houses*.

The applicant had also applied for planning permission to erect a brick garage at the side of the dwelling, along with a front brick boundary wall and gateposts, and this application was also before the Committee (121460/FH/2018). As with the application, it is also proposed to colour tint the brickwork used in the construction of the garage. This is referred to in planning application 121460/FH/2018 (below).

Committee members undertook a site visit to inspect the property prior to the meeting. In providing a summary of the application, the Planning Officer reported that a sample of bricks had been produced for inspection during the site visit that had taken place. In addition, members had expressed concern with regard to the driveway not being level with the public footway and an additional condition had been added to address the drive/ footway levels and drainage issues.

An objector attended the meeting and addressed the Committee regarding their objections to the proposed development.

The spouse of the applicant attended the meeting and addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor A Simcock, ward Councillor (Didsbury East) attended the meeting and addressed the Committee regarding a number of concerns with the development and the work that had taken place at the site. Reference was made to the Conservation Area in which the property is located and highlighted that the current brickwork does not match the existing Shirley Houses adjacent. Concern was raised in view of the building work that had continued without appropriate planning permission, after a site visit had been agreed. Also, no examples of brick tinting had been provided as promised, until a small sample of tinted bricks was produced during the site visit. Work had also taken place to build a separate brick garage and install extensive external lighting to the property without planning permission. Two mature trees had been removed from the site and no new trees planted to replace them. Other remedial works were required to the site including the replacement of the damaged pavement and kerbs caused by heavy contractor vehicles and the installation of a dropped kerb to the property access. Councillor Simcock expressed concern at the actions of the applicant in ignoring the planning process and requested that the strongest possible action be taken.

The planning officer informed the Committee that additional planning conditions have been added which require the applicant to:

- produce samples of brick work tinting for the property to the satisfaction of the planning officer. Any changes to the brick work would need to be carried out;
- plant two trees on the site to replace the trees removed;
- carry out remedial work to repair damage the pavement and kerb, introduce a dropped kerb to the access and amend the driveway level to meet the footway level.

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

In noting the work of officers to address the concerns raised, members expressed concerns regarding the tinting of the brickwork of the building, the loss of the two trees from the site and the levelling of the driveway with the pavement and the installation of a dropped kerb. The point was made that the sample of tinted bricks shown to Committee members during the site visit were not in situ and it would be necessary to see a sample area of the tinting on an area of the building to determine if the colour matched the other Shirley Houses. An undertaking was requested from the applicant to guarantee that two mature trees would be planted on the site at an appropriate time of the year to ensure the trees would continue grow. A member made reference to the impact of the brickwork of the building on the conservation area and planning officers were asked if a 'stop notice' had been considered in view of the unauthorised building work taking place and had enforcement action been taken.

The Committee was informed that a 'stop notice' would be issued if there would significant harm caused from the development and so was not appropriate for the circumstances of this application. Enforcement action had been started and had been suspended following the solution proposed by the applicant to address the issues outlined. It was considered that the proposed solution would address the planning issues in the context of the conservation area.

Councillor Flanagan proposed that the application be Minded to Approve, subject to the following:

- The tinting of a sample patch area of brickwork at the rear of the property to match the brickwork of the other Shirley Houses located within the conservation area;
- To delegate authority to the Director of Planning, in consultation, with the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee, to determine whether the sample brickwork on the property is a satisfactory and matches the colour of the brickwork of the other Shirley Houses.
- The planting of two mature trees in the garden of the property to replace the two trees removed and for planting to take place at an appropriate time of year to ensure the trees continue to grow and mature.
- The carrying out of remedial work to the driveway of the property to ensure that it meets the level of the footway.
- The fitting of a dropped kerb to the access to the driveway and replacement of damaged kerbstones.

Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

Minded to Approve the application, subject to the following conditions:

- The tinting of a sample patch area of brickwork at the rear of the property to match the brickwork of the other Shirley Houses located within the conservation area;
- Delegating authority to the Director of Planning, in consultation, with the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee, to determine whether the sample brickwork on the property is satisfactory and matches the colour of the brickwork of the other Shirley Houses.
- Subject to agreement being reached on the sample of brickwork tinting, the remainder of the brickwork tinting for the rest of the house and the garage is to be completed within a year.
- The planting of two mature trees in the garden of the property to replace the two trees removed and for the planting to take place at an appropriate time of year to ensure the trees continue to grow and mature.
- The carrying out of remedial work to the driveway of the property to ensure that it meets the level of the footway.
- The fitting of a dropped kerb to the access to the driveway and replacement of damaged kerbstones.

### **PH/19/107 121460/FO/2018 – 53 Kingston Road Manchester M20 2SB – Didsbury East Ward**

The application was for a part retrospective application for the erection of a detached garage and a front brick boundary wall with associated metal gates.

The Committee considered the application in conjunction with application 121320/FH/2019.

An objector attended the meeting and addressed the Committee regarding their objections to the proposed development.

The spouse of the applicant attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

Councillor A Simcock, ward Councillor (Didsbury East) attended the meeting and addressed the Committee regarding a number of concerns with the development and the work that had taken place at the site. Reference was made to the Conservation Area in which the property is located and the brick work that does not match the existing Shirley Houses adjacent. Concern was raised in view of the building work that had continued without appropriate planning permission, after a site visit had been agreed in August 2019. Also, no examples of brick tinting had been provided as promised, until a small sample of tinted bricks were produced during the site visit.

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

Members raised concerns regarding the colour of the bricks used in the construction of the garage and the construction of the been completed without planning permission.

The Committee was advised that the application had been processed in accordance with the part completion of the garage at the time. The completion of the garage building would need to be considered by the Committee based on the additional information submitted and the site visit that had taken place prior to the meeting.

Members determined that the application should be Minded to Approve subject to conditions.

### **Decision**

Minded to Approve the application, subject to the following conditions:

- The tinting of a sample patch of brickwork at the rear of the property to match the brickwork of the other Shirley Houses located within the conservation area;
- Delegating authority to the Director of Planning, in consultation, with the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee to determine whether the sample brickwork on the property is a satisfactory and matches the colour of the brickwork of the other Shirley Houses.
- Subject to agreement being reached on the sample of brickwork tinting, the remainder of the brickwork tinting for the rest of the house and the garage is to be completed within a year.