

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 21 October 2021

Present: Councillor Curley (Chair)

Councillors: S Ali, Andrews, Baker-Smith, Y Dar, Kamal, Lovecy, Lyons, Riasat, Richards and Stogia

Apologies:

Councillors Davies, Hutchinson and Kirkpatrick

Also present:

Councillors Hilal, Judge, Leech and Wright

PH/21/72 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, 128916/FO/2020 & 131163/MO/2021.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/21/73 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 23 September 2021 as a correct record.

PH/21/74 124234/FO/2019 & 124453/LO/2019 - The Lodge, Rear Of Old Town Hall, Lapwing Lane, Manchester, M20 2NR - Didsbury West Ward

The Planning and Highways Committee deferred consideration of this application on 23 September 2021 to enable a site visit to take place to better understand the proposal for car parking on the site.

The Chair confirmed that both applications (for the proposed demolition of the existing building and erection of a new build) would be considered together.

124234/FO/2019

The applicant is proposing to demolish the single storey Lodge and replace it with a 2-storey building that would provide meeting and storage facilities for the existing solicitors' office that operates out of the Old Town Hall.

124453/LO/2019

The applicant is seeking Listed Building Consent to demolish the Lodge in order to facilitate the erection of a 2 storey building to form ancillary meeting and storage

space for the solicitors' office operating out of the Old Town Hall.

The applications relate to The Lodge, a single storey detached building located at the rear of the former Withington Town Hall (now referred to as the Old Town Hall) on Lapwing Lane. The Old Town Hall is a Grade II listed building. The Lodge is located within the Albert Park Conservation Area. The Lodge is currently used as a store, in association with the office uses within the Old Town Hall, but it is believed to have originally been the gate lodge to the Corporation Yard that existed where there is now residential properties. The Lodge is accessed directly off Raleigh Close, a short cul-de sac off Lapwing Lane.

This application was placed before the Committee on 2 September 2021 but determination was deferred at the request of the applicant in order to allow for ownership issues to be resolved. The applicants have amended the site edged red location plan so that it only includes land in their ownership.

The Planning Officer addressed Committee and made reference to the site visit undertaken and also clarified that the Core Strategy car parking guidance referred to on Page 29 of the printed report should state that these are maximum number of guideline car parking spaces and not minimum.

An objector spoke against the application stating that they had spoken with other local residents who felt that their town houses were not reflected in the design of this development and added that the town houses living rooms are located on the 1st floor, meaning that the houses would be overlooked. The objector stated that parking has always been an issue on the area and noted a recent marked improvement which he felt was directly linked to the Committee's site visit and referred to photographs showing double parking and spoke of the cul-de-sac being completely blocked off at times. The objector noted that refuse trucks would use the Lapwing Lane entrance and requested that all other commercial vehicles do the same in the event of emergency services requiring access to Raleigh Close.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Hilal (Ward Councillor) attended the meeting and addressed the Committee on the application. The Committee was informed that Cllr Hilal was objecting to the increase in potential on street parking, noting that parking was already an issue and confirming Raleigh Close as a private road whose residents shouldn't have to provide private parking for any overflow from The Lodge. Cllr Hilal requested that the Committee refuse this application.

Councillor Leech (Ward Councillor) attended the meeting and addressed the Committee on the application. The Committee was informed that Cllr Leech wished for Local Ward Councillors to be able to join the site visits, adding that the lack of parking was his main concern, agreeing with the objector's submission and referred to the street scene visible on Google Maps as being a true representation regarding car parking. Cllr Leech stated that the car parking plans were unrealistic in their layout and felt that there should be no parking at the front section of the proposed layout. Cllr Leech agreed that the development would overlook town houses on Raleigh Close and stated that the travel plan proposals for bicycle use was

unrealistic and had not been conducted by an independent survey. Cllr Leech also expressed concerns over whether the development could be restricted to non-office use, stating that this was not an enforceable condition.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee to state that the large south facing window at the proposed development would have a brise soleil, that 15 parking spaces were to be provided, bike storage and shower facilities were included within the travel plan and that the use of the development as non-office space was enforceable.

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

A member requested further information on what local residents on Raleigh Close could do to resolve any parking issues.

The Planning Officer stated that this would be a civil matter due to Raleigh Close being a private road.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for application 124234/FO/2019. Councillor Stogia seconded the proposal.

Councillor Lovecy moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for application 124453/LO/2019, stating that the reduced size of the proposal would not be a competitor for the listed building, therefore she felt there were no grounds to refuse. Councillor Stogia seconded the proposal.

Decision

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

(Councillor Kamal took no part in the considerations or the decisions made on the applications.)

PH/21/75 128916/FO/2020 - The Moss Nook at the corner of Trenchard Drive and Ringway Road, Manchester, M22 5NA - Woodhouse Park Ward

The Planning and Highways Committee deferred consideration of this application on 23 September 2021 to enable a site visit to take place to better understand the proposal for car parking on the site and the potential impact on local residents.

The applicant is proposing the erection of a part two/part three storey hotel on the site of a now vacant restaurant. The Moss Nook is a part single/part two storey building with living accommodation in the roofspace. It sits on the north-eastern corner of the Trenchard Drive/Ringway Road junction and, while currently vacant, it was last used as a restaurant with living accommodation above. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing property and erect a part two/part three storey 30 bed hotel. At the rear of the proposed building the applicant is proposing a 24 space car park accessed off Ringway Road, along with a cycle and bin store. Access to the car park would be via an

Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) controlled barrier. Two of the car parking spaces would be fitted with vehicle charging points; two would be designated disabled bays and three would be designated as *night spaces*, i.e. to be used for guests arriving late at night. To facilitate the development, 10 of the 12 trees within the site would be felled. To compensate for their loss the applicant is proposing to plant 10 replacement trees.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the site visit had taken place and the context and character of the application site was looked at as well as the relationship to neighbouring buildings and also confirmed that the agent was unable to attend but summarised points which the agent had requested be shared with Committee ; The Committee was informed that the scheme had been reduced in height, mitigation was in place to tackle noise and disturbance, vehicle registration recognition was to be installed and the rooftop garden had been omitted. The Planning Officer informed the Committee that wording for condition 20 would need rewording regarding non-opening windows if the application was approved.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

No applicant attended the meeting.

Councillor Judge (Ward Councillor) attended the meeting and addressed the Committee on the application. The Committee was informed that Cllr Judge objected to the scheme on the grounds that it was proposed for a small residential area and that she had already fought for residents' parking due to the overspill from the airport. The Committee was informed that 24 car parking spaces would not sufficiently service the 30 beds at the hotel and stated that the site was not nearby to any tram or bus routes and questioned whether anyone using the hotel would utilise cycling facilities. Cllr Judge further stated that the car park was likely to be permanently full of guests and staff and felt that the building design was out of keeping with the village feel of the area. In conclusion, Cllr Judge stated that she supported local businesses but asserted that this was not the best site for a proposal of this size and asked the Committee to refuse the application.

The Planning Officer stated that the scheme had been reduced in height, that there was a travel and management plan, that this was a sustainable site and of contemporary design.

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

Councillor Stogia expressed concerns regarding overdevelopment of the application site overdevelopment of the site with consequential impacts on residents due to more intensive use, shortfall in car parking leading to increased pressures on nearby residential roads and potential impacts on residential amenity with the travel plan being unrealistic in adequately dealing with the lack of car parking spaces and no assurance where any overspill car parking will take place design being inappropriate with impact on character of the area, street scene in general and visual amenity and lack of landscaped setting/amenity area for the new build , adding that the new build would not sit well with the village feel. Councillor Stogia moved a recommendation to refuse for the reasons outlined.

Councillor Lovecy seconded the refusal, adding that the site visit was helpful in guiding her understanding of car parking issues and lack of public transport links.

The Planning Officer noted that there were clear concerns outlined in the reasons for a refusal and stated that they would take these concerns on board.

Decision

The Committee was minded to refuse the application and requested that officers bring back a report addressing the concerns raised with potential reasons for refusal.

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

PH/21/76 130030/FO/2021 - 25-33 Central Road, Manchester, M20 4YE - Old Moat Ward

The application site comprises 3 large semi-detached Villas, namely nos. 25 to 27 Central Road, nos. 29 to 31 Central Road and 33 Central Road. The properties, which are shown below, were converted into a total of 20 flats (ground to second floor level) under planning permission 019106 approved in April 1983.

The applicant is applying retrospectively to convert the basements of the three properties into five two- bedroom flats. Lights wells to the front, side and rear are also proposed.

Seventeen letters of objection have been received from local residents, along with one from Councillor White. Objections have been raised in respect of the standard of accommodation proposed, waste storage and the impact on residential amenity but the main concern is that insufficient parking spaces have been provided and as a result the proposal would lead to an increase in cars parking on-street on Central Road.

The Planning Officer stated that the applicant's agent had not provided details of the electric charging points or of the number of cycles that can be accommodated within the bike store and therefore conditions 7 and 8 would need to be re-worded for these details to be agreed and then implemented. if the application was approved by the Committee.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

No applicant attended the meeting.

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

A member stated that the scheme in its current format indicated a lack of respect for the planning process and considered this proposal to be "overdevelopment by stealth." The member further stated that this scheme would put pressure on local areas to such extremes that they may feel unliveable and indicated that this style of

application was not part of the Council's strategy. The member stated they would refuse but understood that this would not be possible given the circumstances of the case.

The Director of Planning agreed with the members concerns in relation to works taking place without planning permission.

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

A member gave mention of comments on p81 regarding the initially proposed 20 dwellings and expressed concern that an extra 5 had been added.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there had been an agreement for 20 dwellings in the 1980s and that in 2017 permission had been granted for five additional one bed apartments within the basement areas. The Planning Officer confirmed that the applicant had commenced works without planning permission for five two bedroom apartments and that this was a clear cause for concern.

Councillor Richards moved a recommendation for deferral to allow the submission of information which was referred to by officers but had not been provided by the agent prior to Committee and for this information to be properly considered.

Councillor Lovecy seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed to defer the application for the reasons outlined.

PH/21/77 131163/MO/2021 - Land Bounded by Dinton Street, Cornbrook Road, Chester Road and Trentham Street, Manchester, M15 4FX – Hulme Ward

This Reserved Matters Application sought approval of appearance, layout, scale and landscaping, following the approval of Outline permission referenced 118625/FO/2017 for the erection of a part 11, part 15 building to form a 154 bed hotel and 88 bed apart-hotel building (Use Class C1) with associated public realm, car parking, and other associated works following demolition of existing buildings

The Planning Officer stated that there would be no Chester Road entrance near to the Metrolink station as this was deemed unsafe for commuters. The Planning Officer stated that this application was part of the Cornbrook Hub Strategic Regeneration Framework, a joint document between Manchester City Council and Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council and would add improvements to the area.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

No applicant attended the meeting.

Councillor Wright (Ward Councillor and speaking on behalf of Ward Councillor Bayunu) attended the meeting and addressed the Committee on the application. The Committee was informed that Cllr Wright noted that the scheme was agreed in 2018 but was not elected at this time and would have opposed. Cllr Wright commented that this area is not a gateway to the city centre, adding that residents were scared of gentrification and had not had any opportunity to speak to the developers. There were concerns of the impact of construction vehicles on and around the estate and stated that an arrangement was required to manage this. Councillor Wright also felt that jobs arising from the development would not be solely for local people.

The Planning Officer stated that this was a request for approval of reserved matters only, considering the layout, scale, landscaping and access, adding that the previous consultation in 2014 and 2018 was in line with procedures. The Planning Officer stated that local residents had been notified and gave mention to improvements to the area (which previously housed scrap yards) and the underpass. The Planning Officer stated that, as a joint document between Manchester City Council and Trafford MBC, it was perceived that Manchester had covered their requirements.

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

A member expressed their sympathy with the local residents and asked if there were any conditions available to promote the inclusion of the community.

The Planning Officer stated that this was covered on the initial plan.

A member questioned the addition of trees and waste collection.

The Planning Officer stated that there are 15 trees proposed, 4 of which were located in Trafford and that this was one application for two hotels so there could be either one or two waste strategies.

A member questioned the lack or level of communication between the developer and the community and requested that this be monitored.

The Planning Officer stated that they could reinforce these conditions.

Councillor Andrews moved the officers recommendation of approve for the application.

Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

Decision

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

(Councillor Stogia left before the close of this item and took no part in the consideration or the decision made on the application.)

PH/21/78 130912/FO/2021 - 20 Lord Street, Manchester, M4 4FP - Cheetham Ward

This proposal was for the creation of accommodation for 31 homeless men (sui generis) with an ancillary healthcare office/facility following demolition works and elevational alterations to the existing building. The site is 0.09 hectares, and bounded by Lord Street, Stock Street, Stock Street East and Mehtab House, a car garage/workshop to the north. It comprises two connected buildings and a detached building which are vacant.

The Planning Officer stated nothing further to add.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

The Planning Officer stated that the Homeless Directorate and other associated services were in support of the application.

A member stated that homelessness was a huge issue in the city and, whilst noting that local residents had concerns about the management of this facility, added that the management team had 3 years experience in the Cheetham Ward. The member confirmed that he would address residents' concerns and gave support to this proposal.

Councillor Lyons gave their support to this development and encouraged the long-term use of the facility and moved the officer's recommendation of approve for the application.

Councillor Riasat seconded the proposal.

Decision

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