

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS

**APPENDIX TO AGENDA
(LATE REPRESENTATIONS)**

**on planning applications to be considered by
the Planning and Highways Committee**

at its meeting on 17 March 2022

This document contains a summary of any objections or other relevant representations received by the Department since the preparation of the published agenda. Where possible, it will also contain the Director of Planning, Building Control & Licensing's own brief comment. These summaries are prepared on the day before the Committee. Very late responses therefore have to be given orally.

APPENDIX TO AGENDA (LATE REPRESENTATIONS)

Planning and Highways Committee 17 March 2022

Item No. 5

Application Number 132513/VO/2021

Ward Chorlton Park ward

Description and Address

CITY COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT: Erection of a two-storey extension to form changing rooms, cafe facilities, flexible club/social/training rooms and an extension to the existing gym space following the demolition of the existing changing block building; together with the creation of two 3G artificial football turf pitches, associated floodlighting and fencing; a 67no. space car park and an additional 60 space overflow car park; and associated landscaping

Hough End Leisure Centre And Playing Fields, 480 Princess Road,
Manchester, M20 1NA

1. Residents' Comments

29 further comments in support of the proposals have been received. The comments include the following:

- support the investment into the facility to improve changing facilities and parking provision and that the facilities would allow existing clubs using the site to grow
- Sport also provides a multitude of mental health benefits
- It will improve the facilities for the young people considerably and a welcome addition to the community
- After all we have been through with the pandemic, it is now even more apparent how important good sports facilities are, particularly when you consider the large number of teams that use Hough End for football, rugby and GAA

3 further comments have been submitted. Amongst matters covered in the printed report these comments raise concerns that neighbours to the site were not renotified of the receipt of amended documents and information submitted by the applicant. The concerns raised are:

- The inclusion of the 3G pitches in the visualisations gives a completely different impression of scale and visual impact of the development. This is particularly relevant to residents with literacy difficulties or for whom English isn't their first language, who would rely on the visualisations to understand the scope of the planning application.
- The inclusion of the demolition of the substation in the Air Quality Assessment has resulted in an additional 27 residential properties

within 100m of the demolition boundary and a further 6 dwellings within 50m of the earthworks boundary. Residents of these properties would not have been aware of these impacts from the original documentation.

- From our conversations with residents, we have discovered that many are still unaware of the proposals and therefore have not had a chance to scrutinise or comment on them.

Paragraph 026 of the Government's guidance on Consultation and pre-decision matters [1] states:

“Where an application has been amended it is up to the local planning authority to decide whether further publicity and consultation is necessary in the interests of fairness. In deciding what further steps may be required local planning authorities should consider whether, without re-consultation, any of those who were entitled to be consulted on the application would be deprived of the opportunity to make any representations that they may have wanted to make on the application as amended.”

Given that numerous local residents have been given a misleading impression of the proposed development and will be deprived of the opportunity to make representations that they may have wanted to make, we urge you to reconsider and:

- Notify local residents (and in particular those affected by changes to the Air Quality Assessment) that 26 new and updated documents have been uploaded to the planning portal in respect of planning application 132513/VO/2021.
- Undertake a period of consultation of at least 21 days from the date of that notification to give people sufficient opportunity to review all of these documents and comment on the application as amended.

A request has also been made by an interested party that the Committee undertake a site visit given the contentiousness of the application and the difficulty in visualising or assessing the impact from the documentation provided so that committee members can better understand the proposal and its physical context.

2. Further Consultee Comments

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit – Confirm that having seen the addendum to the Bat report reviewing the electricity substation to be demolished and the elevations of the existing Leisure Centre, they are satisfied that the proposals are very unlikely to have any negative impacts on the conservation status of bats in this area. No further information is required. The previous informative recommendation still applies and can be extended to include the substation demolition.

3. Director of Planning – further comments/observations

A series of additional site photographs are presented in the appendix to this late representation.

In response to the further comments from residents and interested parties the Director of Planning makes the following observations.

The applicant was invited to address some minor perceived inconsistencies and errors within some of the supporting documents and drawings submitted. As a result, a number of documents were amended during the course of assessing the application proposals, these were subsequently uploaded to the Council's Public Access System and were publicly available to view.

The additional visualisations were provided by the applicant and a number of these are also included within the printed report prepared for Committee. The visualisations were also uploaded to the Council's public access system and were available for residents and any other interested party to view.

The application as submitted included the details and scope of the proposed 3G pitches and associated fencing in plan form. It is not considered that the visualisations give a different impression of the scale of the proposals, they are not to a defined scale and do not form part of the intended approved drawings condition that would be attached to any approval.

The applicant prepared an updated Air Quality Assessment (AQA) and this document was uploaded to the Public Access System and was publicly available and viewable and has been assessed as part of the consideration of the application proposals. The AQA concludes that risks to nearest sensitive receptors is negligible from the demolition of the existing substation and changing pavilion. Those residential properties identified within the area most sensitive to impacts from the demolition of the sub-station were originally notified of the application and it should be noted that the demolition of the substation was part of the application proposals as originally submitted and was identified for removal and replacement within the submitted site demolition plan and proposed site plan.

The application was subject of notification letters being sent to 592 addresses within the local area; in addition to this a site notice was posted at the site and an advertisement was placed in the Manchester Evening News. This level and type of notification is consistent with national and local requirements for planning applications of the scale and type of the submitted proposals. The level of responses to the notification process as detailed in the consultations section of the printed report, does not suggest deficiencies in the manner in which people have been able to engage in the planning application process. If residents were to contact the Council for assistance in the way in which they could engage with the process then this would be facilitated in an appropriate manner.

In summary, neither the scale or nature of the application proposals have been amended or changed since originally submitted. The applicant has submitted amended supporting documents and drawings to clarify certain

points and to assist the local planning authority consider the impacts, and these have been assessed as part of the consideration of the application. The Council as local planning authority does not consider that there was a necessity to re-notify neighbours and residents in this instance in line with the Planning Practice Guidance and normal practice.

The recommendation of the Director of Planning remains to **APPROVE** the application.

**APPENDIX TO AGENDA
(LATE REPRESENTATIONS)**

Planning and Highways Committee 17 March 2022

Item No. 6

Application Number 132199/FO/2021

Ward Deansgate Ward

Description and Address

Full planning permission for the demolition of existing structures and the erection of two 51-storey residential buildings (Use Class C3) across two phases, including residential amenity facilities, basement car parking, landscaping and public realm, servicing and access arrangements, highways alterations, and associated works.

Plot F, Great Jackson Street, Manchester, M15 4AX

1. Consultees

HSE – Is satisfied with the information provided with the application (including the fire statement).

**APPENDIX TO AGENDA
(LATE REPRESENTATIONS)**

Planning and Highways Committee 17 March 2022

Item No. 7

Application Number 132214/FO/2021

Ward Piccadilly Ward

Description and Address

Erection of a 15-storey building to form 107 apartments (Use Class C3) at floors 1 to 15, residential amenity facilities including a roof terrace (level 14), associated ground floor cycle storage (68 spaces), two ground floor commercial units (Use Class E/ Sui Generis (Drinking Establishment), multipurpose events Pavilion (Use Class E/ Sui Generis (Drinking Establishment), associated landscaping to site perimeter and rooftop PV panels.

Land South Of Chapeltown Street, Manchester M1 2WH

1. Elected Members

Councilor Wheeler notes that the development has no affordable housing. He believes that if there is scope for a re-evaluation, affordable housing can be achieved. He believes that if discussions with local members been entered into earlier, an alternative design with an accessible housing element would have been possible. He urges all parties to engage better with local members during the pre-application stage.

He questioned officers including modelling of council tax and business rate returns without modelling costs of providing services to businesses and occupants to ensure Manchester people are thriving, not just existing. He considers that we must have both sides as incomplete information can lead to poor decision making. The ten-year income to the council could be mitigated by fewer than half a dozen people in these developments needing residential social care packages.

He notes that the estimated rate of return at 12% is considerably lower than officers usually consider viable. This scheme demonstrates that capital can be raised at this level of return.