

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 17 March 2022

Present: Councillor Curley (Chair)

Councillors: Andrews, S Ali, Baker-Smith, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Kamal, Leech, J Lovecy, Riasat and Richards

Apologies: Councillors Kirkpatrick, Lyons and Stogia

Also present:
Councillor Midgley

PH/22/12 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 132513/VO/2021, 132199/FO/2021 and 132214/FO/2021.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/22/13 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 17 February 2022 as a correct record.

PH/22/14 Application for 132513/VO/2021 - Hough End Leisure Centre And Playing Fields, 480 Princess Road, Manchester, M20 1NA - Chorlton Park Ward

This City Council development related to the 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

The Hough End Leisure Centre, granted planning permission in 2014 and opened in 2015, provides a leisure centre comprising swimming pools, fitness suite and other indoor sports and recreational facilities. The Leisure Centre was developed as a standalone facility but within the context of the wider sports facilities at Hough End. The longer-term vision was to further develop Hough End as a sport and leisure destination to grow and sustain sport and physical activity participation particularly in south Manchester. As part of this it has been long recognised that facilities to support the external sport pitches at Hough End including changing facilities are

deficient. The existing changing pavilion at Hough End playing fields have been condemned and were closed in 2016.

The proposals were subject to notification by way of 592 letters to nearby addresses, site notice posted at the site and advertisement in the Manchester Evening News. In response 1040 comments have been received 1017 of these are objecting to the proposals. Chorlton Park Councillors Midgley, Rawson, and Shilton-Godwin have submitted comments in support of the proposals.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that there had been 2 further letters received since the publication of the late representations, 1 objecting and the other in support of the development, confirming that neither of these raised any new points. The Planning Officer then stated that Condition 7 would require minor re-wording, should the Committee approve the scheme and it was requested that this is delegated to the Director of the Service.

An objector, representing a local opposition group to the application, attended the meeting and addressed the Committee on the application. The objector first requested that the Committee consider a site visit and subsequent deferral of the matter at this hearing, expressing that he felt there had not been enough time to consider the late representation documents and check for/consider any errors. In stating that there was a case for refusal, the objector referred to some 3000 refusal requests from residents. The objector stated that the open space and visual impact of the scheme would impair the site with fencing and floodlights, adding that the open area should be free for anyone to use and noting the effect on wildlife. Further mention was given to the removal of trees, vehicle emissions and public safety issues linked to further cars using the site. The objector questioned the additional car parking spaces, stating that Princess Road was already congested and adding to emissions issues. Mention was given to the floodrisk and water quality at Hough End being impaired by the development and affordability of the new pitches for local residents. In their final comments, the objector raised that Hough End had been given to the people of Manchester and expected that the City Council would honour this.

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

A Local Ward Councillor addressed the Committee and stated that all 3 Ward Councillors were in support of the development. The Ward Councillor noted that the area was well loved and well used but felt that there was space to accommodate this scheme. The amount of local and community interest was noted and appreciated by the 3 Ward Councillors, but they were satisfied with regard to environmental concerns. The Ward Councillor stated that pioneering work had been done in securing one of the first cork in-fill pitches in England and stated that there would be a drive for more active travel to the site. There had been a high membership at Hough End and an increase was much needed with a drive towards increasing Women's Football. The new build would give space for local group meetings and the new pitches were designed for annual and all-weather use. Local high schools would have access too to engage young people with sporting activities. All improved facilities would be handled by a not-for-profit organisation with funding going towards the maintenance of grass pitches. The Ward Councillor acknowledged the concerns

around extra parking but stated that this was needed to deter an increase in on-street parking which would adversely affect local neighbourhoods, adding that the car park plans had been scaled down with bicycles and electric cars being provided for.

The Planning Officer stated that the Council's Open Space Assessment for Hough End noted that it was an area of outdoor sports facilities. Outdoor sports facilities include both natural and artificial surfaces for sport and recreational purposes. Hough End had been assessed as having poor changing facilities, poor grass pitches and no 3G/artificial pitches. Sport England had raised no objections to the loss of grass pitches, subject to conditions listed in the report. The officer further stated that 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 to consider the impacts, and these have been fully assessed and there is no reason why a decision cannot be made on the application. Visual impact had been considered, 61 new trees would be planted alongside hedges, wildflower planting and the overspill car parking had been designed to allow grass to grow through it. The Ecological Unit had assessed the proposals and requirements for biodiversity gain were included. There were also extra measures for a travel plan, regarding improved pedestrian crossing, cycle provision and electric car charging in order to make a move away from using cars.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions.

A member sought clarification on the issue of whether an environmental impact assessment (EIA) was required.

The Director of Planning stated that screening opinion had been carried out in order to establish that an EIA was not required..

A member raised the issue of oil and petrol run-off on the proposed and current, tarmac covered car parks at times of flood and that this was not addressed within the conditions. It was requested by the Member that the conditions should include reference to this issue.

The Planning Officer stated that petrol and oil interceptors would be placed in agreement with the Environmental Agency, adding that the Director of Planning would cover any re-wording necessary for making this explicit within the conditions within the application.

A member questioned if there was any Community use agreement within the scheme.

The Planning Officer stated that this was a requirement of Sport England and this included pricing.

A member raised several issues, requesting the size of the affected area, where current sports pitches were placed, whether trees will be replaced and associated

timelines and whether there was a strategy to ensure a diverse use of the new facilities.

The Planning Officer referred to the diagram edged in red for the size of the area, stated that over 22 full-sized grass pitches would remain with other smaller pitches, that 61 trees would be replaced in the first possible planting season..

The same member questioned if the whole site was green space or just sports pitches.

The Director of Planning stated that the area was primarily for sport with some elements of green space, adding that current facilities were poor.

A member enquired as to whether the overflow car park would be monitored for use and whether it could be returned to a natural state if no longer required.

The Planning Officer stated that there were ways to monitor the overflow car park through the suggested conditions relating to car park management and the travel plan and appropriate words would be added.

A member asked about the possibility of semi-mature trees being planted and also on a like-for-like basis.

The Planning Officer responded to say that trees are well valued overall and that different varieties would be planted for varying reasons and the landscaping condition would be revised to ensure that the species and age of tree planting would require further agreement.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation of Approved for the application. Councillor Richards seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the recommendation of Approved for the reasons outlined within the report.

(Councillor Leech declared an interest in this item, left the meeting during the hearing and took no part in the discussion or decision making process).

PH/22/15 Application for 132199/FO/2021 - Plot F, Great Jackson Street, Manchester, M15 4AX - Deansgate Ward

This application was proposing full planning permission for the demolition of existing structures and the erection of two 51-storey residential buildings (Use Class C3) creating 988 homes across two phases, including residential amenity facilities, basement car parking, landscaping and public realm, servicing and access arrangements, highways alterations, and associated works.

This 0.88 ha site is bounded by Great Jackson Street, Pond Street and Owen Street. It is adjacent to Deansgate Square, with the 64 storey South Tower and 50 storey

East Tower being closest to the site. Much of the area has been redeveloped with the four towers of Deansgate Square (37 to 64 storeys) to the north and Crown Street (21 to 52 storeys) to the west. Two further towers are being constructed at Crown Street phase two which include a school and park.

The Planning officer had no further information or additional comments to make.

No objectors to the application attended the meeting or addressed the Committee on the application.

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

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions.

A member stated their concern regarding the development of almost 1000 homes, none of which would be affordable, concern that the profit appeared to be £4million and £90,000 was being offered towards affordable housing which was expressed as being a poor amount to put back into the community.

The Planning Officer stated that the figures had been independently assessed and added that the scheme would contribute 0.6 hectares of public space that would link up with other spaces and parks around Great Jackson Street, creating a tapestry of public spaces linking Hulme with the City Centre. Additionally, the scheme would contribute £0.5million towards a new school fit-out and there was a clawback mechanism for affordable housing, which was in line with many other previously approved applications put before the Committee.

A member stated that they understood the point around consistency, but it appeared to be that Manchester had less affordable housing proposals than Salford. The member then stated that they could not support this application with the associated level of profit.

The Planning Officer referred back to his previous statement and stated they could not add anything further.

A member stated that they felt £90,000 contribution to affordable housing was small but understood the Planning Officer's explanation. The member felt that there were complex issues but welcomed the contribution towards the school and public realm, stating that it would benefit property owners and the city as a whole, adding that maintenance costs to inhabitants saves the Council the costly task of keeping areas clean and desirable. Whilst noting that £90,000 wouldn't buy a house in Manchester, the member expressed her support overall.

The Planning Officer acknowledged that affordable housing is a big issue but stated that the viability had been well scrutinised, adding that there could be a further contribution, additional to the £90,000.

A member stated that £90,000 was a poor amount but that other factors made the scheme favourable on the whole. The member felt that there were allegations that

Manchester City Council did not take affordable housing seriously but wanted to send a clear message that it is an important issue.

A member expressed that they trust the Officers but asked what profit margins are being considered viable.

The Planning Officer stated that the general figure was 20% but can be as low as 10% or 15% and have to be risk assessed for profitability.

The previous member asked for the figure for this scheme.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this scheme was set at 11% for profitability.

A member requested information on Class C3 in the report and also whether play areas, age friendly seating and social infrastructure, such as doctors and dentists, to serve the new tenants.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the Class C3 information was covered in condition 37 of the report and confirmed that there were conditions covering the outdoor public realm, but that wording could be altered with regard to age friendly seating and a play area could be explored here or across other Great Jackson Street sites. The Planning Officer confirmed that the developers were already contributing to the creation of a new school in the area and that they were working with medical providers at other sites.

A member noted the use of glass walls and questioned if any thought had been given to glare from these onto other nearby dwellings or could be considered in future.

The Planning Officer stated that they will pick up this point for future similar schemes.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to a legal agreement for a financial contribution towards off site affordable housing. Councillor Richards seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to a legal agreement for a financial contribution towards off site affordable housing.

PH/22/16 Application for 132214/FO/2021 - Land South Of Chapeltown Street, Manchester, M1 2WH - Piccadilly Ward

This application was proposing the 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.

2 letters of objection had been received.

The Planning Officer stated that there had been one further representation from a Local Ward Councillor, raising concerns about the lack of any affordable housing and lack of preliminary discussions with local members to address this. The Ward Councillor noted that the profit level was 12%, considerably lower than usual, that demonstrated the ability to raise capital at this level.

No objector attended the meeting or addressed the Committee on the application.

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

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions.

A member stated they were in favour of the parks and pavilion and asked when this aspect would be open to non-residents, whether this was tied into a condition. The member noted that the scheme was smaller than previously considered and raised a concern about maintenance fees for residents and asked how this would be managed. In their final comments, the member noted that there was no affordable housing linked to this development and no contribution being offered either and requested information on accessible toilet for those with impaired mobility.

The Planning Officer stated that the accessible public space may need rewording and confirmed that the cost of this space is borne by the developer. The pavilion and ground floor unit would create some funding towards the upkeep of public space and affordable housing had been assessed for viability. The Planning Officer concluded by stating that 12% forward funding represented a low figure.

A member stated that they felt that this was a good application and, with regard to its location, felt that this would not be an area best suited for affordable housing.

Another member stated that the Planning Committee deal with each application on its own merit and welcomed this scheme and the public realm attached to it. The member stated that the public realm area should be cleared at night to protect residents' amenity and should be child friendly.

The Planning Officer stated that they would look into the concern regarding the space being child friendly.

A member noted the addition of a roof terrace and stated that they can create a nuisance for residents within hearing distance and enquired into whether this terrace would be facing other properties. The member asked if the positioning of roof terraces could be a future consideration and asked what the closing times would be.

The Planning Officer stated that roof terrace concerns could be added to condition 23, relating to the management strategy.

Councillor Flanagan moved the recommendation of Minded to Approve for the application. Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to a legal agreement in respect of reconciliation payment of a financial contribution towards off site affordable housing.

PH/22/17 Application for 132416/FO/2021 - Land Bounded By The Travelodge And Surface Level Carparking To The North, Further Surface Level Carparking To The East, Manchester College To The South And Bury New Road To The West Manchester - Cheetham Ward

This application related to the erection of two buildings part 27, 20, 17 storeys and part 11 and 10 storeys to form a mixed use development comprising of 461 residential apartments (Use Class C3a) and ground floor commercial uses (Use Class E) (718 sqm) together with public realm including courtyard pocket park, landscaping, car parking and other associated works.

The proposal would create 461 homes, of which up to 60% would be affordable (shared ownership and affordable rent), and 718 sqm of commercial space in two buildings ranging in height from 27, 20, 17 storeys and 11 and 10 storeys. There would be public realm and parking for disabled residents only.

One neutral comment has been received.

The Planning Officer had no further comment to add to the report.

No objector attended the meeting or addressed the Committee on the application.

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

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions.

A member requested clarity on how much social housing for rental was included in the 60% figure. A concern was raised in regard to the lack of car parking, noting that this was a busy area for traffic, expressing that residents without car parks could create further problems in the area. The member then asked about priority for the 5 disable parking bays.

The Planning Officer stated that the developer had secured funding from Homes England to fund the additional 55% affordable housing and stated that 121 homes would be available under social affordable rent and 132 as shared ownership. This area had been awaiting development for a long time and that a multi-storey car park has been proposed which may be able to secure parking for residents of the proposed development. The Planning Officer stated that the developer would be responsible for meeting any needs if there was a greater demand for disable parking spaces.

The previous member welcomed the 121 social rental properties but noted that it was rare to have a development which did not provide any parking.

A members welcomed this application in the Cheetham Ward but noted that the provision for disabled parking was lacking and requested a condition to be added to improve this number.

The Planning Officer confirmed that they would include a condition relating to further disable parking.

A member enquired into whether the financial support for the additional affordable housing had been confirmed and, if so, asked whether there could be additional social rental properties.

The Planning Officer stated that the scheme was based on 5% affordable contribution but was assured that the funding was in place, with the work to begin on the development in May 2022.

The previous member asked if the condition could be amended to state that further affordable rental properties would be added if the funding did not materialise, changing the split from 15 social rentals & 8 shared ownership to all 23 being secured as social rental properties.

The Planning Officer stated that the initial 5% affordable housing included social rental properties on the basis of the 15 social rentals & 8 shared ownership split.

Councillor Flanagan moved the recommendation of Minded to Approve for the application. Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement in respect on securing an initial affordable housing contribution and an affordable housing statement.

(Councillor Baker-Smith left during the meeting and took no part in the discussion or decision making process).