

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 2 September 2021**

**Present:** Councillor Curley (Chair)

**Councillors:** Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Hutchinson, Kamal, Riasat, Richards and Stogia

**Apologies:**

Councillors Baker-Smith, Kirkpatrick, Lovecy and Lyons

**Also present:**

Councillors Alijah and Leech

#### **PH/21/56 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 124234/FO/2019, 124453/LO/2019, 124335/JO/2019, 129020/FO/2020, 130515/MO/2021 and 129685/FO/2021.

**Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/21/57 Minutes**

**Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 29 July 2021 as a correct record.

#### **PH/21/58 124234/FO/2019 - The Lodge Rear of Old Town Hall, Lapwing Lane, Manchester, M20 2NR - Didsbury West Ward**

The Director of Planning informed the Committee that a request had been received from the applicant for the Committee to defer the application.

**Decision**

The Committee agreed to defer the application.

#### **PH/21/59 124453/LO/2019- The Lodge Rear of Old Town Hall, Lapwing Lane, Manchester, M20 2NR - Didsbury West Ward**

The Director of Planning informed the Committee that a request had been received from the applicant for the Committee to defer the application.

**Decision**

The Committee agreed to defer the application.

**PH/21/60 127769/FH/2020 - 91 Palatine Road, Manchester, M20 3JQ –  
Didsbury West Ward**

The application is for the erection of a single-storey side and rear extension and recladding of an existing rear dormer to provide additional living accommodation. The application site is an early C20 Arts and Crafts style semi-detached dwelling situated on the eastern side of Palatine Road in the Didsbury West ward and within the Ballbrook Conservation Area. The property is not a listed building. The property is within a rectangular plot measuring 460m sq and set back 15.5 metres off the Palatine Road frontage. There is access along the northern side to the rear garden. It is of smooth red brick and render construction with a rosemary tiled cross-gable roof. There is decorative black and white applied timber bracing to a projecting front gable that spans both properties, terminating in a catslide roof. There are full height canted black uPVC bay windows over both storeys with a black tile hung fascia between. The windows and fascia have been installed by the new owners to replace rotten timber frames. Similar frames have been replaced at the rear. It is noted that the property has been in a poor state of repair for several years until its sale to the applicant in 2017. At the rear there is a low-profile shed type dormer that was installed without the benefit of planning consent by a previous owner. Retrospective consent sought by the current owner under application reference: 117915/FH/2017.

The Planning Officer added nothing further to the report submitted.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

No applicant attended the meeting.

Cllr Leech attended the meeting and addressed the Committee on the application. The Committee was informed that that this was a heritage property within a conservation area and Cllr Leech disagreed that it was not economical to preserve the site, adding that the size and scale of the proposed development would be at odds with the locality.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee to state that the proposal would have limited visibility in the area and was of a contemporary design.

Councillor S Ali moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application. Councillor Riasat seconded the proposal.

**Decision**

The Committee agreed the application for the reasons and subject to the conditions detailed in the report submitted.

(Councillor Kamal took no part in the consideration or the decision made on the application.)

**PH/21/61 124335/JO/2019 - West Didsbury And Chorlton Football Club,  
Brookburn Road, Manchester, M21 8FE - Chorlton Ward**

This application sought to increase the number of times the existing floodlights at the West Didsbury and Chorlton AFC site on Brookburn Road can be used on week days from 12 occasions to 24 occasions during the football season (1 August to 31 May). The site is within the Chorltonville Conservation Area as well as the Mersey Valley which is part of the Greater Manchester Green Belt.

The application was submitted on the 29 July 2021 where the Committee deferred consideration in order to allow a site visit due to concerns relating to the impact of the proposed extension of the use of the floodlights on the residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers.

The Planning Officer provided an update on the application and informed the Committee that there had been a further 4 objections. Within these latest objections it was raised that the Committee's site visit was not during hours that would provide a true example of local residents' experience, that video footage of matchdays provided more context and parking issues were also raised. The Planning Officer gave mention of 2 supporting letters and went on to explain that the use as a sports pitch is lawful and that there are no controls from a planning viewpoint over the number of games that can be played or the hours that the pitch can be used. He also stated that colleagues in Environmental Health were satisfied that the additional impacts would not be unduly harmful provided the lights are turned off at 10pm. The Planning Officer concluded by stating that the recommendation was to approve the application and that, on the site visit, Members had viewed the relationship of the lighting to neighbouring houses and had noted the change in levels.

An objector spoke against the application on behalf of local residents. Reference was made to the impact the activities already have on the amenity of residents, with regard to crowds, noise, inappropriate language and general disturbance. Also, that extending the activities will have a further negative impact, that crowds can number up to 1000 and the noise associated with this scale of attendance had prompted residents to fund their own noise survey. The objector spoke of noise level recordings exceeding 80 decibels, on a par with aircraft engine noise.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

The Planning Officer confirmed that Local Ward Councillors were unable to attend the meeting and that their written representations had been included in the late supplementary pack.

The Planning Officer addressed Local Ward Councillor comments, stating that the floodlights would have some impact but that this is not unusual and that ceasing use at 10pm along with the limited number of additional days proposed that that this is considered acceptable. The Planning Officer added that floodlights would have back-shields and be angled down and added that there could be no restrictions on the number of matches played or the number of attendees.

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

A member referred to consideration of the issues raised from both sides, in that there should be availability for an increase in outdoor activities but also had an equal understanding of the concerns of local residents.

A member made reference to light pollution not being the real issue for residents and referred to the position of residents' bedrooms overlooking the pitch. The member concluded by asking why there was no cap on the number of events and attendees.

The Planning Officer stated that it would not be reasonable for this variation in the number of days to restrict the number of games that could be played or to restrict the number of spectators. The Planning Officer referred to the fact that a sports club had been previously located on the site and concluded by referring to updated conditions on the limited use of the public address system, use of floodlights, and the overall lawful use of the site. It was also stated that officers would speak to the club about the noise from spectators banging on the metal temporary stand.

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

### **Decision**

The Committee agreed the application for the reasons and subject to the conditions detailed in the reports submitted

#### **PH/21/62      129020/FO/2020 - Oakley, 188 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 6LJ - Fallowfield Ward**

This proposal was for the erection of 1 no. 13 storey building and 1 no. part 4 and part 5 storey building to form purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA) to provide 425 bedroom spaces together with the refurbishment of number 188 Wilmslow Road (Oakley House) and the demolition of existing extensions. There had been 246 objections to the statutory notification process together with objections from a number of local Civic Societies and residents' groups. Councillor Ilyas, and Councillor Alijah had also objected together with Withington ward Councillor Wills, Councillor Chambers and Councillor Moore. The site, whilst not in close proximity to the University Campuses, is located along Wilmslow Road which provides a high frequency public transport corridor serving the University Campuses. The proposals would result in a high-density development adjacent to domestic scale developments within Fallowfield, the height, scale and massing of the building would form an over-obtrusive feature within the street scene and the wider area. It had been considered that the proposed 13 storey building would have a poor relationship with the retained Oakley House, a non-designated heritage asset.

The Planning Officer provided an update on the application and informed the Committee that there had been a further 4 objections, but no additional issues raised.

An objector spoke against the application on behalf of local residents. Reference was made to the impact the development would have on Platt Fields Park, Shakespeare Garden and nearby residents. The objector had concerns over the claim that the scheme would reduce the need for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) and felt that this was not the case. The objector agreed that the site would benefit from some development but wished to see a scheme for long-term residents.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Alijah attended the meeting and addressed the Committee on the application on behalf of other Local Ward Councillors who could not attend. The Committee was informed that the development was unlikely to affect the ongoing use of HMOs for the student population in the area, that the site was next to a park which was a resource for local residents, would cause harm to the local community and was therefore not appropriate.

The Planning Officer referred the Committee to the six reasons for refusal contained in the report submitted and summarised the main areas of concern.

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

A member spoke with concerns that one of the Universities had backed the application and referred to an agreement with the Executive that student accommodation would be built adjacent to University buildings.

The Planning Officer confirmed the University's support for this application but stated that it was considered that there was no demonstrated need for additional student accommodation at this location.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of Refuse for this application. Councillor Richards seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee refused the application for the reasons detailed in the reports submitted.

(Councillor Stogia declared a prejudicial interest and left the meeting and took no part in the consideration or the decision made on the application.)

### **PH/21/63      130394/FO/2021 & 130395/LO/2021 - Brunswick Place, Bradford Road, Manchester, M40 7EZ - Ancoats & Beswick Ward**

The proposal was for planning and listed building consent to create 153 homes in the refurbished Brunswick Mill and the erection of a part 6, part 8 storey building to form 100 homes and a 5 storey building to form 24 homes (Use Class C3a) creating 277 homes in total. The proposal would include the refurbishment, removal/demolition, repair and reconfiguration of Brunswick Mill to create work spaces, retail and

community uses (Use Class E and Use Class F2) (2034 sqm) at the ground floor and creation of 153 residential apartments (Use Class C3a) with the upper floors following demolition works together with the erection of a part 6, part 8 storey building to form 100 residential apartments (Use Class C3a) and a 5 storey building to form 24 residential apartments (Use Class C3a) (277 apartments in total across the 3 buildings) with associated car parking, roof top amenity space, access and servicing, landscaping, pedestrian access to the Ashton Canal and other associated works.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the Committee would be required to vote separately on the planning application and the listed building consent.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

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

A member commented that they supported the application in principle but questioned whether a Section 106 agreement was in place.

The Planning Officer stated that there was an S106 agreement and there would be a re-test on the contribution after 80% of the premises were sold. The Planning Officer stated that this was an opportunity to save a historic mill building and improve a large section of Bradford Road frontage.

A member requested clarity on the use of zinc cladding and whether any contribution would be made to green spaces in the area.

The Planning Officer stated that this contribution could be considered if the application was more profitable.

A member made a request for a deferral, in order to undertake a site visit.

The Director of Planning stated that they would require a reason for a deferral for this purpose.

The member requested a site visit to inspect how the scheme relates to the canal and the historical aspects of the mill building.

The Planning Officer stated that the only part of the building marked as listed was adjacent to the canal.

Councillor Y Dar moved a recommendation to defer both applications for a site visit. Councillor Davies seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee agreed the deferral of both applications, in order to undertake a site visit.

**PH/21/64 130515/MO/2021 - Land Off Cringle Road, Manchester –  
Levenshulme Ward**

This proposal was for 57 homes of which 29 would be 4 bedroom and 28 3 bedroom. Eleven of the new homes (9, 3 bed and 2, 4 bed) would be affordable (equating to 20% of the scheme), available on a shared ownership basis and would be delivered by the applicant alongside Southway Housing.

The Planning Officer commented that planning permission had been granted.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

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

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of approve for the application. Councillor Riasat seconded the proposal.

**Decision**

The Committee agreed the application for the reasons and subject to the conditions detailed in the reports submitted

**PH/21/65 129685/FO/2021 - 209 Slade Lane, Manchester, M19 2AE –  
Levenshulme Ward**

This development was in relation to the provision of a 12 bed unit for the care of adults (18+) experiencing or recovery from acute mental issues and requiring care. Two forms of care would be provided:

- Step down care – For individuals leaving mental health wards and care settings and requiring support prior to returning home or relocating to alternative accommodation as part of a transition towards independent living. This form of care would be co-ordinated with individual GPs, hospitals and on-going health care support;
- Step up care – For individual experiencing acute mental health difficulties and requiring emergency care for brief periods following either general practitioner (GP) and hospital referral. This form of care provision seeks to relieve pressure on health care resources, including hospital bed availability.

The operation of the unit would be co-ordinated by the applicants as the unit medical doctor and care manager respectively.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

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

**Decision**

The Committee agreed the application for the reasons and subject to the conditions detailed in the reports submitted