

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 16 February 2023

Present:

Councillor Curley – in the Chair
Councillors S Ali, Andrews, Davies, Flanagan, Hewitson, Kamal, Leech, Lovecy, Riasat and Sadler

Apologies: Baker-Smith, Y Dar and Lyons

Also in attendance: Councillors Hilal, Midgley and Rawson

PH/23/06 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 135565/FO/2022, 135566/LO/2022, 135583/LO/2022, 133148/FO/2022, 134705/FO/2022, 134946/FO/2022, 135309/FO/2022, 134891/FO/2022, 135048/FO/2022, 135321/FH/2022, 135647/FO/2022, 135604/FO/2022 and 135713/FH/2022.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/23/07 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2023 as a correct record.

PH/23/08 135565/FO/2022, 135566/LO/2022 & 135583/LO/2022 - Land Bounded by Deansgate, Great Bridgewater Street, Watson Street & Peter Street Manchester M3 4EN - Deansgate Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that presented an application relating to planning and listed building consent to refurbish and convert the Great Northern Warehouse into Grade A office accommodation. The Leisure Box complex would be partially demolished and three residential buildings (16, 27 and 34 storeys) constructed to form 726 homes. Deansgate Terrace North and Deansgate Terrace South would be refurbished and altered to form commercial space. New public realm and highway works are proposed.

Two objections had been received.

The planning officer referred to the Supplementary Information, stating that there were 3 planning applications to consider for the development and the Committee could consider each individually. 10 further objections had been received since publication of the main agenda, focussing on the impact to nearby residents, Porchfield Square and St John's Gardens, concerns over associated traffic flows. Manchester Central had enquired about information on acoustics and removal of the bridge link and Historic England were to comment on the 3 towers at the development. The dwellings were built for rent. With reference to acoustic readings, some dwellings would require enhanced glazing. A proposal for traffic on Great Bridgewater Street had been modified at condition 41 to remain as a two-way street. The Committee's consideration of this application should not rely on traffic flows and other modifications.

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

The applicant attended and addressed the Committee on the application, stating that the scheme was SRF compliant, would create new job and public realm and had been devised by a passionate team. The team had been delivering great developments for the past 7 years.

Councillor Davies, spoke as a Ward Councillor. Reference was made to objections regarding Condition 41, prohibiting traffic on Great Bridgewater Street. Councillor Davies noted that Historic England had commented on the 3 residential towers as "not ideal" and would like further consideration given to the impact of them in terms of noise and light impacts. Councillor Davies and residents referred to the message not coming through in pre-planning regarding closure of roads. Consultation was also undertaken during Christmas and some residents had not understood the full focus and had thought it was just for the warehouse and square. They were surprised to learn of the other aspects of the scheme. Councillor Davies welcomed the development, stating that Great Northern Square was vastly underused and the addition of a village hall and play area were very good.

Councillor Flanagan proposed to move the officer's recommendation to approve the scheme with 2 additional conditions: Confirmation that the offer of electric charging points would equal 100% and that the developer would pay for these. Condition 41 to be addressed to remove traffic restrictions/narrowing of Great Bridgewater Street and Watson Street. Councillor Flanagan raised concern about a lack of disabled parking on Watson Street but stated that he could approve if the reference to traffic restrictions/narrowing of Great Bridgewater Street and Watson Street were removed.

Councillor Leech added that there was zero affordable housing. He noted £6m and the same amount to be spent on public realm and enquired whether £5m could be spent on public realm with a further £1m going towards affordable housing.

Councillor Lovecy raised concerns about impacts on nearby residents in terms of light and shadowing at Longworth Street and asked if this had been addressed in the report. In response the planning officer stated that this had been taken into consideration, adding that all nearby residential building were considerable distance away from the proposed towers.

Councillor Flanagan accepted that 10% profit would not allow for any associated affordable housing funds but asked if there was any condition to receive some funding if the profit margin was higher i.e., over 15% profit. The Director of Planning stated that this was already within the report.

Councillor Flanagan moved the officer's recommendation of approve for the scheme, subject to conditions within the reports and with the additional condition regarding removal of restrictions/narrowing of Great Bridgewater Street and Watson Street.

Councillor S Ali seconded the proposal.

Councillor Andrews sought confirmation that the Committee were moving approval for all three applications within the report.

The Chair confirmed that the three applications had been moved for approval with Councillor Andrews and the Committee before proceeding with the vote.

Decision

The Committee resolved to move the officer's recommendation of Minded-to-Approve subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement in relation a future review of the affordable housing position, subject to other conditions and amendments within the reports and with the additional condition regarding removal of traffic restrictions/narrowing of Great Bridgewater Street and Watson Street.

(Councillor Davies left the room after making representations as a Local Ward Councillor and took no part in the ongoing discussions or decision-making process).

PH/23/09 135278/FO/2022 - St Gabriel's Hall, 1 Oxford Place, Manchester, M14 5RP - Ardwick Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that presented an application relating to a vacant student hall of residence (St. Gabriel's Hall), situated in Victoria Park Conservation Area. The proposal involves some demolition, the erection of part 4 storey, part 5 storey buildings and, the refurbishment and restoration of buildings to form 319 student bedrooms, landscaping, cycle parking, car parking and associated works.

Two objections had been received.. Representations had been received from Schuster Road and Park Range Residents Association, Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society, Manchester Civic Society and Fallowfield & Withington Community Guardian Group and SE Fallowfield Residents Group.

The agent addressed the Committee. The Committee was advise that the buildings would be sympathetic to the surroundings and the developers had consulted with residents and Ward Councillors. Mature trees would be retained and tree coverage would increase by 18%. Parking conditions had been accepted with an overall traffic plan in place and this scheme would offer good accommodation to attract students to Manchester and improve the setting in the conservation area.

Councillor Flanagan stated that he did not have any issues to raise other than the provision of two blue badge parking spaces for 319 students, stating that this represented less than 1% disabled parking and enquired what the visitors space were for. He felt that disabled students would not be “car free.” He stated he was minded-to-refuse if no provision would be proposed.

The planning officer stated that a condition could be added to address Councillor Flanagan’s concerns, adding that all parking spaces could be fully accessible.

Councillor Flanagan stated that he couldn’t accept this, and it seemed uncaring to have lacked provision for disabled parking in the first place which the developer should have addressed.

Councillor Lovecy seconded Councillor Flanagan’s motion of Minded-to-Refuse.

The planning officer sought clarification that the Committee were satisfied with the scheme other than parking issues.

The Chair put the vote to the Committee for a Minded to Refuse decision based on the lack of EVC and disabled parking.

Councillor Leech enquired as to what would happen if this motion was not carried.

Councillor Andrews stated that he would move the officer’s recommendation with the added condition regarding additional EVC and disabled parking.

Decision

The Committee were Minded-to-Refuse owing to a lack of electric vehicle charging points and disable parking.

PH/23/10 134705/FO/2022 - 247 Upper Brook Street, Manchester, M13 0HL - Ardwick Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to a change of use to create short stay emergency accommodation for homeless people (sui generis).

A total of nine ensuite bedrooms (with a shower and WC) would be formed providing accommodation for families within reconfigured ground, first and second floors. The basement would accommodate a kitchen / dining room, living room and an office. No external alterations to the building had been proposed. A bin storage area would be located in the rear garden, which also has the capacity to accommodate cycle storage.

One letter of objection with 15 signatures had been received.

The planning officer added nothing further to the information within the published reports.

The agent for the applicant attended and addressed the Committee stating that this was an application for homeless accommodation which was previously a homeless person's hostel. This developed scheme could provide ensuite accommodation for families in the short term for urgent need. This was a vital service for the city council which would house persons and families prior to them gaining permanent residences. The agent understood objectors concerns but felt that there may be based on stereotypical views about homeless people and noted that the council's own homeless team view this operator with high regard, as they already run other similar premises. Any persons presenting with drug use issues would be well managed and reported to the city council and the premises would be staffed 24hours a day. The agent stated that the residents would not be a nuisance and asked the Committee to lend their support to this scheme.

The planning officer stated that there was a condition attached for a management strategy for the premises to run as per requirements within the report.

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

Councillor Flanagan seconded the proposal.

Councillor Davies sought clarification on the room layouts and space measurements.

The planning officer confirmed that the space would provide for 27 people with a maximum 8 week stay and added that there was provision for an additional room/bed for larger families.

Decision

The Committee resolved to move the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

PH/23/11 134946/FO/2022 - Jessiefield, Spath Road, Manchester, M20 2TZ - Didsbury West Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to a resubmission following the refusal of planning permission for a similar, but larger development that was subsequently dismissed at appeal.

The current application sought to overcome the previous reasons for refusal and the conclusions of the Planning Inspector. The redesigned development proposed the erection of a part two, part three storey building to form 26 retirement living apartments to be managed by McCarthy and Stone.

Following notification of the application 112 objections had been received, together with a petition containing 67 signatures. Following amendments to the proposal and a further period of neighbour re-notification, a further 46 letters of objection had been received.

The planning officer brought member's attention to the Supplementary Information report which stated that in response to concerns raised, the applicant had provided an additional car parking space in order to provide 20 spaces for the proposed 26 apartments. This ratio is the same as for the previously refused scheme where the percentage of the car parking was considered acceptable.

An objector attended the hearing and addressed the Committee on the application stating that there had been 112 views expressed on the application without 1 letter of support. Concerns were raised in relation to overlooking, mass and scale and stated that the report failed to cover the planning history and previous refusals properly.

The applicant attended and addressed the Committee stating that they had worked collaboratively on a great design and noted that officers now recommended approval.

Councillor Hilal, spoke as a Local Ward Councillor to the Committee and objected to the application in relation to overdevelopment, traffic issues, lack of car parking, overlooking, scale and massing, ecological issues and loss of wildlife.

Councillor Stanton also addressed Committee as a Ward Member also objecting to the application

Councillor Leech addressed the Committee as a Local Ward Councillor and welcomed the objector's points made against this scheme. Councillor Leech stated that he objected to the application, raising issues relating to car parking levels, overlooking and privacy, scale and massing, construction traffic and the lack of any mitigation for car parking on nearby roads. He also stated that the existing building should be retained and that there was a need for family housing

Councillor Leech then left the meeting and took no further part in the discussion or decision-making process.

The planning officer stated that the previous application had been refused for three reasons and had these been provided. The Inspector dealing with the appeal concluded that there would be no unacceptable loss of privacy or overlooking and the comings and goings, activity and disturbance would not be inappropriate. The officer detailed the use of obscured glazing and distances from the rear boundary and included details as to why the scheme was now acceptable in scale and massing terms including the removal of the four storey elements. It was also clarified that the previous application had not been refused due to a lack of car parking spaces. Affordable housing had been fully tested and was found not viable due to the lesser amount of units but would be re-tested as part of the recommendation for a legal agreement if approved. Also, there was a construction management condition proposed to address these concerns.

The Chair reiterated that the previous scheme was refused for various reasons and the planning officer stated that this previous scheme had an officer's recommendation of refusal for 3 reasons, but this did not include car parking.

Councillor Lovecy proposed the Committee be move of Minded-to-Refuse on two grounds:

1 – The scale and massing of the scheme - referring to the previous application warranting the same reason for refusal, Councillor Lovecy conveyed that she felt this assessment still holds weight against this current proposal in its large footprint and dominance owing to its height.

2 – Parking – this was not considered at the previous application appeal as the Committee had not considered it as a reason for refusal. This scheme required a range of parking options and Councillor Lovecy was not convinced by the current submission. The distance to shops and other amenities would not deter the use of vehicles by residents.

Councillor Davies raised concerns in relation to the level of parking proposed.

Councillor Andrews seconded proposal made by Councillor Lovecy of Minded-to-Refuse.

Decision

The Committee agreed the proposal of Minded-to-Refuse, based on the scale and mass of the scheme coupled with the lack of adequate parking and disabled parking spaces.

(Councillor Flanagan declared a personal interest in the item and withdrew from the meeting for the duration taking no part in the discussion or decision-making process).

(Councillor Sadler left during this item and took no part in the discussion or decision-making process).

PH/23/12 135309/FO/2022 - Didsbury Technology Park - Phase 3, Princess Road, Manchester, M20 2UR - Didsbury West Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the erection of a six storey commercial office building (Use Class E(c)(i,ii,iii), Use Class E (g)(i,ii)), with ancillary cafe on ground floor (Use Class E(b)) and roof mounted Solar PV array ; together with the Erection of three storey decked car park (Sui Generis) together with landscaping, highway works, and other associated works.

In response to the notification process, four responses were received from nearby residents raising concerns around the scale of the proposed development, loss of daylight, noise, the principle of further commercial development, traffic generation, and the sustainability of the project.

The planning officer stated that for clarification purposes the late representation details that it is proposed to revise the off-site highway works condition to include Traffic Regulation Orders for additional junctions along Barlow Moor Road.

The agent for the applicant attended and addressed the Committee.

Councillor Leech, speaking as a ward Councillor, stated that his only concern had been regarding three junctions on Barlow Moor Road and stated that, if these were now covered by amendments in the supplementary information report, he could accept the proposal.

The planning officer had nothing further to add to the points raised.

(Councillor Leech left the meeting after making his comments and took no further part in the discussion or decision-making process).

Councillor Flanagan moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application, subject to all amendments of conditions contained in the Late Reps report.

Councillor S Ali seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to move the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application, subject to all conditions and amendments thereof, contained in the reports.

PH/23/13 134891/FO/2022 - Northern Lawn Tennis and Squash Club, Palatine Road, Manchester, M20 3YA - Didsbury West Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the replacement of existing grass tennis courts to form 3 no. all-weather tennis courts bounded by a perimeter fence and illuminated by new floodlighting columns.

In response to the application as originally submitted, 61 representations had been received including 1 objection, 3 neutral and 57 in support. Following revised information and a further period of renotification, 5 additional representations had been received, including 1 neutral response and 4 in support.

The planning officer had no further information to add to the report submitted.

The applicant attended and addressed the Committee.

Councillor Flanagan moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor S Ali seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to move the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application, subject to all conditions and amendments thereof contained in the reports.

**PH/23/14 135048/FO/2022 - Northern Lawn Tennis and Squash Club,
Palatine Road, Manchester, M20 3YA - Didsbury West Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the erection of an 8.3 metre-high building to house two padel tennis courts, with associated lighting and infrastructure.

The proposed building is situated centrally within an existing tennis club and seeks to provide two new courts for padel – a relatively new racquet sport similar to a mix between tennis and squash. The application site is situated within Blackburn Park Conservation Area.

In response to the application as originally submitted 51 representations have been received. 28 in support, 1 neutral and 22 of which object to the proposal. Following revised information and a further period of renotification, 10 additional representations have been received, including 1 in support, 1 neutral response and 8 objections.

The planning officer confirmed that this second application for the same site as the previous application was for a new build indoor court.

The applicant attended and addressed the Committee, stating the club had engaged with acoustic consultants and that acoustic fencing was also proposed. The Padel Courts would address the lack of tennis courts across the City.

Councillor Hilal addressed the Committee as ward councillor regarding concerns in relation to noise and requested the Committee to hold a site visit.

The planning officer stated that there was an acoustic report submitted and added that environmental health officers were satisfied that the noise impacts were acceptable. There was a condition to ensure that acoustic insulation is installed alongside an acoustic fence. Expert officers at the council were assuring the planning officer that impacts would not be unacceptable.

Councillor Flanagan stated that he understood the need for such facilities in Manchester but had concerns about noise.

The planning officer stated that the advice received gave an assurance that noise would be mitigated.

Councillor Leech noted issues relating to noise but felt that a site visit would not help the Committee.

Councillor Davies stated that noise was the main issue here but felt that a site visit would not help the Committee. She added that it would not be likely that the

Committee could check other padel courts as part of their decision-making process. Councillor Davies felt that sustained durations of padel court use and the noise from this may not be acceptable and added that all individuals have a different tolerance level to noise. Noise is known to have an adverse effect on health. Councillor Davies supported Councillor Flanagan's comments and felt that the Committee required a greater understanding of noise mitigation.

The Director of Planning noted Councillor Davies having proposed a reason to defer the application, to have a greater understanding of noise mitigation, adding that the report could return to the Committee in more detail.

Councillor Flanagan expressed that it may be helpful to have a site visit with an acoustic/noise expert to explain but added that a deferral could also be considered.

Councillor Andrews proposed a motion to defer the application for the Director of Planning to arrange a more detailed report to come before the Committee.

Councillor Flanagan seconded the proposal.

Councillor Davies requested that the future report contained information in less-technically detailed terminology also.

The Director of Planning stated that they could have a colleague from environmental health to join the meeting to address any concerns.

Decision

The Committee resolved to defer the application for the Director of Planning to arrange for a more detailed report regarding noise mitigation to come before the Committee, at a later date.

PH/23/15 135321/FH/2022 - 15 Craigmere Avenue, Manchester, M20 2YQ - Didsbury West Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that proposed to erect a part single/part two storey extension to the side of the dwelling to provide additional living accommodation.

Objections had been received from four local residents, ward Councillor Hilal and the West Didsbury Residents Association. The main concerns raised include the impact on residential amenity, pedestrian/highway safety, insufficient parking and the overdevelopment of the site.

The planning officer drew members attention to the fact that the front elevation had been redesigned and that the bay window at the current property would be retained.

The applicant attended and addressed the Committee.

Councillor Hilal addressed the Committee and stated that she supported the residents living in Craigmere Avenue in their objections to this application.

The planning officer stated that the scheme had been reduced, the frontage was redesigned, and porch removed. There was also a condition for a replacement tree.

Councillor S Ali proposed to move the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor Flanagan seconded the proposal.

Councillor Lovecy stated that she supported the amendments to windows and the replacement of the tree.

Decision

The Committee agreed the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application, subject to all conditions and amendments thereof contained in the reports.

(Councillor Leech declared an interest in this item and left the room for the duration, taking no part in the discussion or decision-making process).

PH/23/16 135647/FO/2022 - 550 Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7AA - Chorlton Park Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the erection of a retail foodstore (Class E) with new access arrangements, following demolition of existing structures. It is proposed that the store is operated by Lidl.

In response to the application as submitted, 180 representations had been received. 76 in support, 9 neutral and 95 of which object to the proposal. One of the letters titled Community Letter of Objection was received with 122 signatories.

The planning officer stated that an additional condition was recommended to ensure that an acoustic fence to the service yard be erected should the Committee approve the application. Also, to clarify, due to concerns raised a Road Safety Audit was undertaken by the applicant and this included a site visit. From 3-4pm in November 2022, in line with school finishing times. Highways officers and TfGM were both satisfied that all traffic concerns had been addressed in the report with further pedestrian facilities to be looked into.

An objector attended and addressed the Committee on the application stating that she was representing 122 residents in Chorlton Park Ward. There had been 97 other online objections. This scheme was not suitable due to the proximity to 4 schools, a food bank and family support charity centre. The objectors had concerns with the traffic modelling for this scheme and having made their own checks, believe that the increases in traffic could be as much as 200 cars per hour. This would have a detrimental effect on air quality and have the potential for road accidents. There had

already been a road traffic accident leading to life altering injuries for a child in the area and the objector reported an incident happening the day before the hearing. This scheme was not consistent with the Council's own strategy. The headteacher of Loreto High School had submitted a comment, stating that they had concerns for pupil safety if the development went ahead. There had been 2 hit and run incidents already. There were already queues along Nell Lane adding to car fumes, safety issues and clear signs of frustrated drivers making it already unsafe at present. This scheme would exacerbate these dangers. There are already 4.5 thousand schoolchildren in the locality and the headteacher of Chorlton High School had also submitted concerns, stating that this was an extremely difficult area due to traffic and the Metrolink stop. The shared access to Hough End Hall was already too busy and schools had made attempts to stop parents using the local highways to drop off and collect their children. It was felt that the addition of a supermarket in this location would increase parental pick ups as they would use the supermarket when arranging drop off and collection of children. Due to the lack of diligence in tackling the issues in the area and failure to consider the potential impacts, the objector requested that the Committee refuse this application. The objector inferred that the reports had been rushed through and objections not considered properly. A site visit during school hours would prove the objectors' case should the Committee want to consider this option. In their closing statement, the objector read from a parent's objection which considered that a serious and deadly accident would be likely to occur and those who let the scheme go ahead would be to blame.

The agent for the applicant attended and addressed the Committee on the application stating that the scheme would create jobs, that highways officers were satisfied with traffic and road concerns and deemed them safe and appropriate. The proposal would be a modern and attractive building matching Hough End Hall. There would be no less to amenity to local residents, and no impact to air quality and there are clear benefits. The site was a brownfield site, and the development would improve the area. The location of the store allowed for shoppers to visit via tram, bus bicycle and on foot. In their closing statement, the agent stated that approving the application would create growth and jobs.

Local Ward Councillor Rawson addressed the Committee and stated that this was a busy junction with 4 schools nearby. The plan for a Lidl supermarket was welcomed by some residents as this would bring an affordable supermarket to the area which those nearby would not have to visit in a vehicle and there was support for this being available to pedestrians and cyclists. The Merseybank estate was in a "food desert" area with a lack of local shops/supermarkets and many were keen for the scheme to go ahead for this reason. Councillor Rawson stated that he had children in local schools and so understood the concerns around the issues raised. There would be 40 jobs available at the supermarket for local people and Wards Councillors had campaigned for better parking restrictions in the area and had achieved a 30mph speed limit, pedestrian zone, pelican crossing and crossing patrol. If the scheme were to be approved, then there could always be additional highways mitigation applied in the area. Councillor Rawson expressed that there should be higher interventions at the key times of the school day. A site visit would show why the area required extra measures, such as a no deliveries condition/policy at key school times, no reduction of pavement space, crossing points and no kerb mounting. Lidl could be asked to provide a crossing patrol for the first year of operations and should

considered additional cycle parking instead of car parking space. The junction of Mauldeth Road West and Nell Lane would require some traffic calming and bus shelters should be added at the supermarket.

The planning officer addressed the concerns raised including a justification for the number of car parking spaces proposed and that Highways officers and TfGM were satisfied but conditions were in place to address issues on access to Nell Lane. An upgrade to the junction using a MOVA system was proposed, and air quality had been properly assessed. The planning officer reminded the Committee that the recommendation was for approval.

Councillor Flanagan stated that he was glad to see the current building being up for demolition but understood the issue and felt that the positive aspects of the scheme had to be balanced with safety concerns. In his closing statement, Councillor Flanagan noted the four schools and a park in the vicinity of this scheme and proposed a site visit at a peak time.

The planning officer reiterated that all traffic concerns had been fully assessed by Highways officers and TfGM.

Councillor Leech seconded the proposal for a site visit and stated that he was considering a move of Minded-to-Refuse. He did welcome the idea of a low-cost supermarket but felt that the objector had made a good case against the traffic modelling and concurred that he had little faith in this as well. Councillor Leech was in the belief that changes along Mauldeth Road West due to this scheme would shift traffic down onto an already busy Nell Lane and felt that this traffic flow had not been fully considered. It would be pertinent for the Committee to make a site visit at a peak time due to the four schools in this area.

The planning officer assured the Committee that the Highways officers had looked at all traffic considerations in great detail and added that the fallback position would be that the existing building could be back in use if the scheme was not approved.

Councillor Leech reiterated his concerns regarding the claim that there would be zero additions to traffic flow, adding that this could not be the case and expressed having no faith in the traffic modelling.

The Chair stated that the Committee had expert advice to help in the consideration of all applications.

The Director of Planning stated that a site visit may require a meeting to assess the best time for this purpose. If the scheme was deferred due to concerns that officers hadn't considered the traffic management plans accordingly then again, officers would come back with further information.

The Chair stated that some Committee members had family commitments and may not be available to make a site visit at school times so suggested an evening visit that would still be at a busy time, possibly the day before the next Planning and Highways Committee meeting.

Councillor Davies explained that there were other experts involved within the representations in that headteachers knew their area very well and stated that a plan of the site in relation to the nearby schools would have been helpful. Councillor Davies was satisfied with the proposal of a site visit and mentioned that it may be worth asking the local headteachers what they felt the best time to visit would be.

The Chair reminded the Committee that they should take both sets of experts into account, adding that there was a process within the Labour Group to deal with these concerns and then had the Committee vote on the proposal for a site visit as proposed by Councillor Flanagan and seconded by Councillor Leech.

Decision

The Committee agreed the proposal to undertake a site visit, owing to concerns raised around traffic and pedestrian safety, junctions and highways at the site.

PH/23/17 135604/FO/2022 - Land to the rear of 354 Wilbraham Road, Manchester - Chorlton Park Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the erection of 65 dwellings (Use Class C3(a)), with associated infrastructure, including landscaping, ecological mitigation, drainage and car parking and access from Wilbraham Road. It also includes the demolition of a garage to the rear of 354 Wilbraham Road. It is also proposed to improve the floodlights on an adjacent site occupied by Maine Road FC.

The application site comprises an overgrown former playing field, it is understood this was last in use in 2016. In mitigation for the loss of the field, there is an agreed package of replaced and enhanced sport facilities.

The proposals were subject to the notification by way of 449 letters to nearby addresses, site notice posted at the site and advertisement in the Manchester Evening News.

In response 30 comments were received, 19 of these objecting to the proposals from 18 separate addresses, 11 comments were received in support.

The planning officer did not add anything to the report submitted.

An objector attended and addressed the Committee on the application stating that they were representing other local residents who wished for the Committee to undertake a site visit. It had been discovered that someone owns land that is part of the plot for development. Traffic on Wilbraham Road was very busy with two other side roads joining this road close to the proposed scheme. If allowed, the development would add to traffic issues in the area, and it was expressed that there was no detailed consideration of this within the reports. The layout of dwellings in this application were not in keeping with others in the area, being 2.5 storeys tall as opposed to 2 storeys. There was a threat to the urban character of the area and there had not been enough consideration to the flood risk posed at this site. Residents and land engineer had discussed flooding issues, but this had not

appeared in the reports. The mitigation for the loss of this plot as a playing field was to be covered at Alexandra Park but the objector questioned if residents local to the park had been consulted on this.

The agent for the applicant attended and addressed the Committee on the application stating that all land at the site was under the applicant's control. The applicant works with disadvantaged children across Manchester and were looking at redundant land for building opportunities following funding cuts to the associated charities supported by the applicant. The site had last been used for sports in 2016 and had no on-site facilities. The applicant had engaged with local residents and Ward Councillors and conveyed that the scheme was acceptable. The playing pitch mitigation was covered by nearby availability at Alexandra Park. There was a clear need for affordable family homes in Manchester and this proposal would feature 13 homes with a mix of social rent and mortgages. Air source heat pumps would be installed at all residences meaning no gas boilers would be installed. There were no road safety issues with the scheme as each dwelling had space for two cars with electric vehicle charging and cycle storage. Gardens would be fully vegetated making this a sustainable development. It was stated that there had been no objections received and the Committee was requested to approve the application.

Local Ward Councillor Midgley addressed the Committee stating that this proposal met a need for affordable housing in the area. The applicant had made modifications to match houses in the locality and reduced the initial proposed number of dwellings. The number of affordable rental dwelling had been raised from 4 to 7 and also 6 first time buyers would be able to get onto the property ladder. In their closing statement, Councillor Midgley felt that there was a need for some assistance with traffic calming measures to Wilbraham Road.

The planning officer stated that the grant of planning permission would not override any legal issues such as land ownership and this was a matter that the developer would need to resolve. Regarding flood risk concerns, this had a full drainage scheme attached and there would be additional tree planting which would assist with any overlooking issues. The design of the residences had been considered acceptable, the loss of what was previously a playing field had been addressed and this would provide much needed affordable housing. The planning officer concluded by stating that a new junction subject to traffic regulation orders would be created for this development.

Councillor Flanagan noted objectors concerns and felt they had to be balanced with the need for affordable housing in this area. He proposed to move the officer's recommendation of Minded-to-Approve for the application with an added condition, whereby the developer would contribute towards traffic calming measures. If this could not be a condition, then it was requested that Highways officers work with Local Ward Councillors.

The Director of Planning referred the Committee to Condition 7 regarding highways works and explored the potential for rewording of this condition to address any impacts on the highway and concerns raised by the Committee. If this was agreeable, the Director of Planning stated that this could be delegated to herself to

make the required arrangements with the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee.

Councillor Flanagan stated that this was agreeable and satisfied his earlier proposal to move the officer's recommendation of Minded-to-Approve for the application with the Director of Planning's recent comments as a condition.

Councillor Riasat enquired on the legal issue with the entrance to the site if there were an actual dispute regarding land ownership and asked where this would lead to.

The planning officer stated that there was only one access point and if this area was in dispute the developer may not be able to gain access and therefore would not be able to implement the planning permission.

Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal from Councillor Flanagan.

Decision

The Committee agreed the officer's recommendation of Minded-to-Approve for the application with an added condition whereby both the Director and Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee, would amend condition 7, to address the concerns of the Committee regarding impact on the highway and traffic.

(Councillor Leech declared an interest in this item and left the room for the duration, taking no part in the discussion or decision-making process).

PH/23/18 135396/FO/2022 - Manley Park Play Centre, York Avenue, Manchester, M16 0AS - Whalley Range Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to planning permission, granted in March 2021, for extensions to an existing single storey community centre building located within Manley Park. This followed a previous approval in 2020 for extensions to the existing play centre. The extensions approved were to provide indoor covered activity spaces at the Community Centre to the north and south of the existing building.

The approved extension to the south was to form a 9.2-metre-high activity hall, whilst the extension to the north was of a lower height (approximately 5 metres in height). Works have commenced on site to deliver these approved extensions. Following these approvals, a further application was submitted in September 2022 (application reference 134732/FO/2022) which sought to provide a further enlargement to the rear of the existing building, a new front entrance, together with roof amendments to provide a more unifying design across the proposed development. These revised proposals indicated an increase in height of the activity hall to 9.3 metres. This application was approved by the Council's Planning and Highways Committee meeting held on the 20 October 2022.

The current proposals seek to provide a further enlargement to the rear of the previously approved extension to the north of the existing building to form a 42m² therapy room.

110 addresses were notified of the proposals, 2 responses were received raising concerns with the proposals and particularly implications in terms of pedestrian and highway safety in the vicinity of the park.

The planning officer had nothing to add to the printed report.

Councillor Flanagan moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application

Councillor S Ali seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Approve the application as set out in the report submitted.

PH/23/19 135731/FH/2022 - 24 Victory Street, Manchester, M14 5AE - Moss Side Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the applicant seeking permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension together with a front porch enlargement, to provide additional living accommodation for a family dwellinghouse. The property is not listed, nor is it located within a conservation area.

Thirteen neighbouring dwellings were notified of the proposed development and four letters of objection were received as well as one enquiry.

The planning officer referred to further comments from two local residents contained within the supplementary information report.

Local Ward Councillor Bell addressed the Committee and stated that she understood the need for larger family homes in the Moss Side Ward owing to a general lack but stated that local residents were against the proposal and that she also objected. The neighbours had stated that there would be a loss of light, their properties would be overlooked and that there would be disruption and distress. One local resident suffered with autism which was exacerbated by noise and Councillor Bell requested that the Committee consider the impact that this extension would have on neighbouring residents. The privacy of nearby residents would be impacted on and Councillor Bell concluded by stating that she supported a refusal of this planning application.

The planning officer stated that this extension measured 3.5 metres which met the limit stipulated in planning policy and added that 3 metres could be added without need for planning permission. There was separate legislation for construction noise.

Councillor Flanagan felt that there needed to be some balance observed, adding that it was not a huge extension and the work would probably be done reasonably quickly. Councillor Flanagan understood the need for families to have larger homes in this area and moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor Lovecy questioned whether the extension would have windows to the sides and stated that one neighbouring house is under a social rental scheme. She asked if planning considerations took into account the loss of light to the adjoining properties and noted the impact felt by these residents.

The planning officer stated that the concerns are of a tolerable level and the difference between the requirement for planning application or not was 0.5 metres and confirmed that windows of the extension looked out onto the applicant's own garden space.

Councillor Andrews seconded Councillor Flanagan's proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the officer recommendation of Approve for the application as detailed in the report submitted.

(Councillors Riasat and S Ali both left the meeting as this item commenced and took no part in the discussion or decision-making process).

PH/23/20 Confirmation of The Manchester City Council (Land at 52 Didsbury Park, Didsbury) Tree Preservation Order 2022 - Didsbury East Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing to inform the Committee about the background and issues involved in the making of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on 6 September 2022 and to recommend the confirmation of this Tree Preservation Order.

The planning officer had nothing to add to the report submitted.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation within the report.

Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the recommendation to instruct the City Solicitor to confirm the Tree Preservation Order at 52 Didsbury Park, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 5LJ, under Section 199 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and that the Order should cover the trees as plotted on the plan attached to this report.