

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 28 July 2022

Present: Councillor Curley - In the Chair

Councillors: S Ali, Andrews, Davies, Flanagan, Hewitson, Kamal, Leech, J Lovecy, Lyons, Riasat and Richards

Apologies: Councillors Baker-Smith, Y Dar and Stogia

Also present: Councillor Good, Robinson and Wilson

PH/22/39 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 133746/FO/2022, 132489/FO/2021 and 130922/FO/2021.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/22/40 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 30 June 2022 as a correct record.

PH/22/41 133746/FO/2022 - Land at Junction of Parrs Wood Lane, Manchester, M20 5AA - Didsbury East Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described that this proposal related to the erection of a 6 storey building to form 75 no. residential apartments, and associated car and cycle parking, landscaping and highway works.

The application site currently formed part of the existing car parking area to the south of the associated Tesco Store located off Parrs Wood Lane located within the Didsbury East ward. As well as hardstanding associated with the car parking area the site also contained associated landscaping and trees.

The proposals were subject to notification by way of 272 letters to nearby addresses, site notice posted at the site and advertisement in the Manchester Evening News. In response 235 comments were received, 228 of these were objecting to the proposals. Didsbury East Councillors Foley, Simcock and Wilson have submitted comments objecting to the proposals.

Amongst other matters that were set out within the main body of the report it was considered that the principle of high density residential development in this part of

South Manchester did not accord with the adopted planning policies in place in Manchester; that the proposals did not provide for an adequate level of on-site car parking to serve the development; and, the applicant had failed to demonstrate that the proposals would not give rise to unacceptable impacts on the highway network in the vicinity of the site.

The Planning Officer had nothing further to add to the printed published report, noting the receipt of the late representations.

An objector, representing residents, addressed the Committee on the application. He stated that the proposed high-density development was inappropriate for the location and if permission was granted would adversely contribute to the traffic congestion already experienced in the area. He also raised the issue of road safety in the area. He stated that the number of car parking spaces proposed in the scheme would detrimentally impact on local on-street car parking. He concluded by supporting the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

The agent addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Wilson, Member for Didsbury East Ward addressed the Committee. He stated that he and his fellow ward councillors supported the officer recommendation to refuse. He reiterated the issues raised regarding the impact on local traffic congestion and on-street parking, with little or no mitigation measures proposed in the application. He further stated that the consultation exercise undertaken by the applicant had been disappointing.

Councillor Flanagan moved the recommendation to Refuse the application.
Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Refuse the application for the reasons given in the report.

PH/22/42 133055/FO/2022 & 132890/LO/2022 - The Stables, Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M20 5PG - Didsbury East Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described that the applicant had applied to install 7 no. external air handling units within the roof valley on the west end (unit 3) of the grade II listed stable block to provide air conditioning for the office(s) within. The works would include a steel deck, attached to the roof trusses below, which would run the length of the roof valley and support the air handling equipment, along with 1 no. rooflight to provide access for maintenance.

No objections had been received from local residents or businesses. The proposal, however, had been assessed against its impact on a listed building and it was considered the units, due to their siting and associated works, would be to the detriment of the Stables causing less than substantial harm to the designed heritage asset.

Members were advised to note that the City Council had been notified of an appeal against non-determination. Members cannot now determine the application, but a resolution is required as to what decision the Committee would have made if Members were able to make a decision.

The Planning Officer had nothing further to add to the printed published report.

No objectors attended the meeting to address the Committee on the application.

The applicant or agent did not attend the meeting to address the Committee on the application.

Councillor Flanagan moved the recommendation to Minded to Refuse the application. Councillor Ali seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved that it was Minded to Refuse the application for the reasons given in the report.

PH/22/43 132489/FO/2021 - Port Street, Manchester, M1 2EQ - Piccadilly Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described that the Planning and Highways Committee were 'minded to refuse' this proposal on 30 June 2022 on the basis that it would be one storey taller than set out in the Piccadilly Basin Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF).

The proposal was for 481 homes with two commercial units in a part-33, part-11, part 9 part 7 storey building with hard and soft landscaping. 211 letters of objection had been received from 2 rounds of notification and 34 letters of support. Many did not object to the principle of the site being developed, supporting the creation of more housing with appropriate facilities and were keen to see it brought back to life but objected to the form of development.

The objections related to design and scale, heritage and townscape, affordable housing / need and viability, privacy and living conditions of adjacent residents, provision of public realm, traffic, highways and parking, climate change / embodied carbon, compliance with Planning Policy, precedent and the consultation process.

The Planning and Highways Committee were 'minded to refuse' this proposal on 30 June 2022 on the basis that it would be one storey taller than set out in the Piccadilly Basin SRF. They requested officers to present a further report with a potential reason for refusal.

The applicant had subsequently revised the scheme and had reduced the height to 33 storeys in order to fully comply with the Piccadilly Basin SRF. In light of this, officers could not present a potential reason for refusal.

The scheme would be consistent with the height indicated in the Piccadilly Basin SRF. The manner in which it complied with approved planning policies was clearly set out and addressed in the report. It was these policies that must form the basis of decisions made by the Local Planning Authority, including the Planning and Highways Committee. Planning law required that applications for planning permission are determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicated otherwise.

The report concluded that Officers considered that the scheme was acceptable and should be approved.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee by making reference to the late representations, one of which had been received at noon on the day of the meeting.

The Chair stated that there were to be no more late representations to be considered where they were received with 48 hours of the Planning and Highway Committee meeting.

An objector, representing local residents, addressed the Committee on the application. She stated that residents had welcomed the Committee's previous decisions to be 'minded to refuse' and supported the challenge provided by Members to Officer recommendations. She stated that it remained the opinion of residents that the proposal was inconsistent with the Piccadilly Strategic Regeneration Framework, the Ancoats and New Islington Neighbourhood Development Framework and the ambitions for the Northern Quarter. She stated that it was her opinion that precedent had been set to refuse this application when other applications had been refused in the locality due to the size of the proposed development. She stated that the need to develop the site appropriately and sympathetically was recognised however the application proposed was contrary and incompatible with the Strategic Regeneration Framework. She further referred to the detrimental impact the proposal would have on sunlight, particularly on the local school, the detrimental impact on the historic nature of the area, parking and highways and the inadequate provision of public realm. She concluded by asking the Committee to refuse the application.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee by acknowledging the comments expressed by both the objector and agent. He said that the issues raised by both had previously been articulated and discussed at previous meetings when this application had been considered by the Committee. He reiterated that the sole reason the Committee had given to refuse at the meeting in June was on height, that is the higher building was one storey higher than in the SRF, and this had been addressed by the applicant.

A member spoke on the application and stated that the scale of the development would compromise various schemes and conservation sites in the local area and added that the reduction in height by 1 floor did not provide any reason for them to approve the application.

The Planning Officer stated that there was also a requirement to assess the public benefits of the scheme and noted that the report addressed this balance.

Councillor Flanagan stated that the previous concern was about exceeding the recommended height as set out by the Piccadilly SRF; going by the evidence provided and recommendations deemed appropriate in the SRF, he felt that the proposal was now suitable and agreed the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve.

Another member stated that they felt that they could not support this amended proposal and expressed that the reduction by 1 storey would not make a huge difference. The member felt that there was still an issue with affordable housing at the site and noted that the Committee did not feel that the £1m contribution towards affordable housing across the city was acceptable at the first application hearing in May 2022, stating that the profits made from the scheme could in fact support affordable housing on-site.

The Planning Officer stated that there had been 'no minded to refuse' at previous meetings based on affordable housing, adding that the profit margin would now be lower due to the reduction of the scheme and that it could be difficult to defend a reason for refusal on this ground should the matter go to an appeal.

Councillor Andrews stated that he had supported a Minded to Refuse decision in June 2022 due to the excessive height under the Piccadilly SRF policy but explained that he now supported Councillor Flanagan's move to Approve the application and Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved that it is Minded to Approve the application, subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement in relation to an initial off site affordable housing contribution, with a future review of the affordable housing position.

PH/22/44 132574/FO/2021 - Land South of Stables Car Park, Paradise Wharf, Ducie Street, Manchester, M1 2JN - Piccadilly Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described the application was for 4, three-bedroom townhouses adjacent to the canal towpath. They would be part 4, part 5 storeys with integral garages for cars and bikes. Vehicle and pedestrian access would be via an existing vehicle access adjacent to The Stables.

The dwellings would mainly be red brick with the fourth floor set back from the main elevations and finished in a glazed ceramic cladding. Roof terraces are formed in the remaining area.

The upper levels of the southern elevation have Juliette balconies, recessed balconies, and the main roof terrace. At the ground floor, adjacent to the towpath,

feature brick work and arched windows would provide interest and create defensible space.

One of the 4 trees on site would be removed. Servicing would be from Ducie Street and each household would have an internal bin store with space for 4 bins.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee by making reference to the late representation received from Councillor Wheeler.

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

A representative from the construction arm of the developer attending on behalf of the applicant and addressed the Committee.

A member stated that they were happy to support the proposal but asked if the garages were big enough to drive into and then exit/enter the vehicle and if there could be internal depictions in the reports.

The Planning Officer responded by advising that the size of the proposed garages was appropriate for vehicles and that additional design documents could be accessed via the planning portal.

A Member welcomed the inclusion of electric vehicle charging points in the proposal.

Councillor Flanagan proposed a recommendation to approve with an additional condition that stipulated that at least one parking space outside of the Stables should be designated as a disabled parking space and that this should space be serviced with the provision of an electric vehicle charging point. Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Approve the application, subject to the inclusion of the additional condition proposed by the Committee.