

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 27 July 2023**

**Present:** Councillor Lyons - In the Chair

Councillors Shaukat Ali, Chohan, Curley, Davies, Gartside, Hughes, Johnson, Kamal, Lovecy and Riasat

**Apologies:** Councillors Andrews, Hassan, Hewitson and Ludford

**Also present:** Councillors Bayunu, Igbon and Wright

#### **PH/23/54      Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 135544/FO/2022 & 135545/LO/2022, 136721/FO/2023 and 130387/FO/2021.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/23/55      Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 2023 as a correct record.

#### **PH/23/56      136934/FO/2023 - Greenheys Building, Pencroft Way, Manchester, M15 6JJ - Hulme Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing for the erection of 7-storey building comprising office and laboratory floorspace (Use Class E); cycle parking, hard and soft landscaping, access and servicing.

An anchor tenant would occupy the ground, mezzanine and first floor, with the remaining floors available for occupiers in the life science and healthcare sectors. The anchor tenant is an internationally significant health research organisation that would bring substantial direct and indirect socio-economic benefits to Manchester Science Park (MSP) and the Corridor eco-system, and leverage MSP's advantages in terms of locational clustering with major knowledge and research institutions.

The proposal would contribute positively to the city's economy creating jobs and training opportunities in key growth sectors for residents and support growth through graduate retention.

4 letters of objection had been received. The grounds of objections concern design, the nature of the use, traffic impacts, impacts on the residential character of the area and sunlight and daylight.

The Planning Officer did not add anything to the printed report.

An objector stated that the neighbourhood consultation did not make it clear what the building would be used for. The height would cause overshadowing and there were concerns over noise and possible unknown pathogens and the effect on air quality. He questioned the purpose and work that would be undertaken in the laboratories and commented on the change in class use. New drugs normally use some form of animal testing and the objector felt that Hulme should be an animal testing and vivisection free zone and asked the Committee to lead on ethical and political decisions when considering this application.

The applicant's agent that Bruntwood, have 40 years experience in delivering office, research and lab spaces. This proposal would be a milestone for the science park and enhance the capabilities of the university's NHS foundation trust. The anchor tenant and other high specification laboratories would attract occupiers in the science and technology sectors. The proposal would add employment opportunities and socio-economic benefits. No animal testing would be carried out on this site.

Ward Councillor Bayunu acknowledged the investment but also had to consider her residents. She felt the developer should work with the community. There had been some consultation but not all issues had been addressed. There would be more development and she asked for all involved to be brought together and added as a Council and Hulme as a Ward, should be animal testing and vivisection free zones.

Ward Councillor Wright noted that 9 trees would be replaced by 27 expressed having had difficulties with other developers on this issue. Previous construction activity at MSP had caused problems with contractors taking up parking spaces so a condition on a construction plan would be welcomed. Daylight and sunlight would affect a small number of residents but was still an important issue to raise. Some dwellings were below balconies and received less sun and daylight. Jobs should be targeted at the Hulme area and the area should be vivisection free. She supported the new pedestrian crossing.

The Director of Planning stated that the Committee could take land use into account but moral/ethical wishes could not be taken into account.

The Planning Officer stated that 27 trees are shown on the submitted plans. He offered apologies regarding the impacts of previous construction activity. The impacts on daylight and sunlight would be minimal because of existing overhanging balconies. The developer would work with the works and skills team and engage with the community.

Councillor Davies understood that the Committee could not take animal testing into account but felt that the developer would be well advised to consider this especially in this Ward. Bruntwood had caused problems to neighbouring residents and residents should be able to access and park cars during construction. Councillor Davies hoped for the construction plan would reflect this.

Councillor Johnson felt that a commitment to community engagement would be useful and could be added as a condition if the Committee moved a Minded to Approve decision and asked what this might look like. The Planning Officer stated that there could be an additional condition in the construction plan to engage with the community.

Councillor Curley expressed that this was a good report, well presented and felt that any ongoing discussions with Bruntwood would be successful. Councillor Curley then moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application

Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to move the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application subject to an additional condition whereby the developer amends the construction plan to include community engagement and subject to conditions set out in the report.

### **PH/23/57      135544/FO/2022 & 135545/LO/2022 - 466 - 472 Moss Lane East Manchester M14 4PJ - Moss Side Ward**

The application was placed before Committee on 6 July 2023, where it was resolved to defer consideration of the proposal to allow for a site visit to enable Members to gain a better understanding of the impact the proposed development would have on the local neighbourhood, owing to concerns expressed regarding the height of the development.

The Committee considered the reports of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described that full planning permission was sought for the demolition of 470-472 Moss Lane East and conversion of 466 – 468 Moss Lane East, in order to facilitate the erection of a 7-9 storey building to form purpose-built student accommodation (sui generis) and provide in total 261 student bedrooms with a mix of studios and en-suite rooms set within clusters bedrooms.

Listed Building Consent was also sought for internal and external alterations and extension, in the form of a link building to the Grade II listed 466 to 468 Moss Lane East to facilitate its conversion to purpose-built student accommodation.

17 individual representations had been received, 12 of which objected and 5 of which supported the proposed development. Objections had also been received from Platt Claremont Residents Association, Moss Side Tenants Union, Great Southern to Western Community Action Network, The Victorian Society and from Councillor Emily Rowles on behalf of the Moss Side Councillors.

The Planning Officer addressed a note of clarification from Councillor Sharif Mahamed who had stated that the scheme would address and improve the needs of students in the city. As stated in the Late Reps report, the applicant had resolved to offer 20% of the bedspaces at a 20% discount on their base market value and to

make these rooms available on this basis. Furthermore, there would be no parking permits available to tenants.

Councillor Bayunu addressed the Committee as a Moss Side resident, stating that this was a sign of a creeping impact of student accommodation off the Oxford Road corridor. In terms of accuracy amongst those already living at this location, a door to door check had been made by residents and found lots of families on site. There should be clearer information about the impact this development would have on the area. It was expressed that the Council cannot open up to this kind of development. Councillor Bayunu objected to this application and felt there were inaccuracies that required addressing.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee and stated that this was a significant student accommodation offer which was greatly needed in Manchester, the shortfall of which was having an impact in retaining potential family homes as they were currently being used as HMOs. This site was 200 metres from Oxford Road and a 10 minute walk to the University. The University had written with a representation of support for the application. Purpose built student accommodation (PBSAs) were of high need. The application was sensitive to the context of the area and of suitable scale and massing. Preservation of the building style had been included. There were no impacts from loss of light and a 24 hour contact point was available. Manchester was an attractive destination and students were an addition to the city. The scheme now offered 20% reduced rate dwellings, as set out in the late report.

The Planning Officer stated that due diligence had been applied with units to be lost having been checked (a summary was in the printed report on page 103). There would be packages to rehome anyone affected by this demolition and re-development of this site.

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

Councillor Curley stated that the site visit had been very useful and felt that this scheme would improve the building. The footpath was noted to be in a poor state and it was put to the Planning Officer whether a condition could be added to improve this as part of adjacent public realm.

Councillor Johnson understood the need for student accommodation in Manchester and stated that Moss Side was densely populated and more homes for residents and families would be good. Disabled parking on the proposal was insufficient and this would be an ideal site due to the park and nearby public transport links. Councillor Johnson noted the use of terminology relating to the Oxford Road Corridor and raised that this site is not on Oxford Road, adding that taller buildings can be seen on Oxford Road and expressed that this should be a development of lesser height. Councillor Johnson was concerned that this would set a precedent and encourage further tall buildings in this residential area. Councillor Johnson stated that she may wish to propose a motion to address the height aspect later in the meeting.

Councillor Davies had concerns for any families living at the current site. Page 103 of the printed report referred to the standard of the building at present. Councillor Davies enquired about the details of these families who are due to be rehoused and needed reassurances before making any decision.

The Planning Officer stated that the footpath issues raised by Councillor Curley could be included as part of Highways. Regarding disabled parking, 3 spaces were available on the street and a further condition could be added. The University had plans for students already due to move into this development when complete. Regarding the height, this scheme was closely related to the Oxford Road Corridor and based on its own merits and that this application had been deemed as appropriate for this area. Families in this dwelling would be re-homed.

Councillor Davies considered that there was insufficient awareness of these families and their voices had not been heard as part of this aspect of the application.

Councillor Lovecy expressed that the site visit was very useful. She stated that she was not Minded to Approve for this application due to the scale being more in line with buildings on Oxford Road. The impact of 7 and 9 storey buildings in this area would impact negatively on the amenity of local residents. Also, the heritage aspect of this building should be considered. Whilst the building would be improved, it would then be dwarfed by the additional buildings.

Councillor Hughes stated that he was considering supporting the application after the site visit but now had concerns about the rehousing of families as this is always a difficult proposition with the potential for children having to change schools.

The Director of Planning stated that the rehousing issue is something that the Planning Team take very seriously and, having asked for information on current tenants, found that they were all under short term tenancies. If the Committee were Minded to Approve for the application, the Planning Team would work with the Chair of the Planning & Highways Committee to create a condition for development not to start until there was an awareness of ongoing arrangements. This would be taken away for discussion with the developer and legal services.

Councillor Johnson welcomed this proposal from the Director of Planning but added her concern that the overall scale and massing issue remains.

Councillor Riasat added that the site visit was useful, that there was a similar sized building close by and confirmed his support for the application, moving the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve.

Councillor Shaukat Ali seconded the proposal with the added condition stipulated earlier by the Director of Planning concerning a rehousing strategy.

Councillor Lovecy stated her preference for a maximum 6 storey height and raised concerns over the impact on the neighbourhood.

Councillor Johnson wished to propose a motion regarding the scale and massing.

The Chair explained due process, in that, if the proposal put forward by Councillor Riasat fell then another motion could then be considered for the Committee to make a decision on.

Councillor Davies felt that the onus should be on the developer to make rehousing arrangements.

The Director of Planning confirmed that this responsibility would lie with the developer.

Councillor Curley noted that a similar scheme in Chorlton had been agreed under the same process and asked the Director of Planning if the same process would be adhered to.

The Director of Planning confirmed this with Councillor Curley.

The Chair confirmed with the Committee that the Minded to Approve decision was for both applications concerning this development.

### **Decision**

The Committee resolved to move the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve for both applications subject to an additional condition whereby the developer entered into discussions with the city council regarding the rehousing of current tenants and devise their own rehousing strategy and subject to conditions set out in the report.

### **PH/23/58      136721/FO/2023 - Site Of Former Day Nursery, Longhurst Road, Manchester, M9 8NS - Higher Blackley**

The Committee considered the reports of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing concerning the erection of 14 x 3 storey semi-detached houses and 2 blocks of 2 storey apartments containing 8 flats in total (Class C3) with associated car parking, landscaping, regrading of ground levels and boundary treatment.

The principle of the proposal and the scheme's contribution to regeneration, as set out in the report, accords not only with national and local planning policies, but would also deliver key outcomes for the city delivering new homes for affordable rent (through a Registered Provider). Any potential impacts on local residents are fully set out and addressed. These include wider impacts from construction to operational impacts such as traffic, trees and visually from the development itself.

The site is located in Higher Blackley Ward, is broadly rectangular in shape, and covers 0.46 ha. It is vacant, with an area of hardstanding with areas of grass, self-seeded vegetation and trees. It is bounded to the east by St. Andrews Community Hall (single storey building), with two storey housing to the north of Longhurst Road, St. Andrews Church and rectory to the south, and Blackley Cemetery to the west.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the printed report and late reps report.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application and stated that this scheme would offer 22 new houses at 100% affordable rent rate as part of Project 500.

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

Councillor Lovecy stated that this development was very welcome and added that she supported the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

Councillor Curley expressed that this was good news for those on housing waiting lists and looked forward to many more schemes of this nature.

Councillor Johnson raised a query regarding the comments on page 155 on opportunities to create improved areas of green infrastructure.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this was attached to the application as part of the landscape scheme.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to Approve the application, subject to conditions set out in the report.

### **PH/23/59      130387/FO/2021 - The Former Gamecock Public House, Boundary Lane, Manchester, M15 6GE - Hulme Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing for the erection of a part 7, part 11 storey purpose built student accommodation building comprising 197 bed spaces (56no. studios, 14 no. threedios, 10 no. cluster units (Sui Generis use class)).

The Committee was minded to refuse an application for a part 9 part 13 storey (PBSA) building providing 261 bed spaces on 31st May 2022 on the basis of the scale of the application and the shortages of parking spaces for disabled people.

There were objections to original scheme including neighbours, 'Block the Block' a resident-led campaign supported by Hopton Hopefuls, Aquarius Tenants and Residents Association, Hulme Community Forum and On Top of the World Hulme, Hopton Hopefuls, 2 employees of Manchester University, a GP practice on Booth Street West, the Guinness Partnership and One Manchester. 3 representations were also received from members of the public supporting the proposal. Councillor Annette Wright and Lucy Powell MP objected.

Revised drawings were submitted to address the above reasons for refusal; 25 objections from neighbours and an objection from 'Block the Block' were subsequently received.

Members were minded to refuse a revised scheme on 20 October 2022 on the basis of scale and dominant visual impact and the lack of parking in close proximity to the entrance for those with disabilities and the use of on-street spaces for disabled parking spaces.

The Late Reps report stated that 20% of the bedspaces would be available at a 20% discount of market rent. The recommendation was altered to Minded to Approve subject to a legal agreement regarding the containing affordable rent obligations.

An additional representation from Councillor Wright referred to the previous Minded to Refuse decision. The Chair confirmed that 2 objectors were to address the Committee, sharing the 4 minutes allotted speaking time between them.

The first was a tenant of Hopton Court and had lived in Hulme all his life. Hulme had undergone many changes, not all good. He got involved with the Tenant's Committee at Hopton Court and arranged for tables and benches to be placed outside. Then they managed to arrange for Hopton Court to be specifically for the 50+ age group and retired people. With the addition of Birley Fields campus and now this proposal for PBSA across the road he felt that this was too much for the neighbourhood. This was a piling in of students that would erode the community. Noise and litter were already a problem and Hopton Court was designed with bedrooms at the front of the building, making sleeping spaces only 20/30 yards away from the development. Other people in the building had been persuaded to join THOSE spending time in the outside area and this development would be a detriment to this outdoor space. The local GP were also concerned over the impact of this scheme and felt that the impact would be huge. In closing his objection statement, the objector stated that he did not know why this application had come before the Committee again.

The second stated that this proposal would negatively affect the amenity of residents and tenants. The north face of the apartments in her building were second bedrooms and, in many cases, children's bedrooms. This proposal was close to neighbouring dwellings and the overshadowing would have an impact on the energy bills. There were concerns over the disabled parking bays, a nearby cul-de-sac and loss of access. The objector stated that she was a blue badge holder and implored the Committee to refuse the application.

The agent stated that this is a sustainable location and recognised that the developer had to respect existing tenants. They took this seriously and offered a free community hub space. This developer was an experienced operator and would create a move-in and move-out strategy. 3 additional disabled parking spaces had been created on-site and students would not be permitted to own cars. Deliveries would be made within specified hours and an engagement plan had been created regarding litter picking in the vicinity and a contact point for regular liaison with the community. If approved, the proposal would regenerate the site. Access would be available throughout construction to all roads.

Ward Councillor Wright noted previous decisions in October 2022 and May 2023 and reasons for refusal plus other historical refusals from 2008 and 2012. She felt that the daylight and sunlight issues were more impactful due to dwellings being single aspect at Hopton Court. The only open space for tenants is an outside area and



some tenants already suffer with vitamin D deficiency. There was no need for student accommodation in this residential area. The application was opposed by the local GP and many more. Tenants had been assured there would be no impact on this site but were right to oppose this application. The accommodation on offer is not good enough to house students. Some areas of the development have no natural light, would be overshadowed and have no outside space. Developers see the site as a blight but residents see it as their area.

Ward Councillor Igbon stated that this site has looked the same for decades with no investment in the area. The developers were looking to make money and there were concerns over traffic and deliveries. The application stated that students would not be allowed to have cars but this was out of the developer's control and students with cars would have to use local on street parking which was also a concern. The local GP is the second busiest surgery in Manchester and the impact of an additional 200 people living in this area would create huge impacts to the community. Trees would have to be removed, one of which had a TPO. As a resident of the area, Councillor Igbon felt there was a blasé attitude from the developers and while a place for students to live was needed, this was the wrong site.

Ward Councillor Bayunu was shocked to see the officer's recommendation was no longer for refusal. Whilst she agreed that Manchester needed PBSAs, the impact to the community and amenities could not be ignored. 20% of the residents at Hopton Court have vitamin D deficiency, depression and anxiety. Allowing this development to go ahead would add to these problems. This was an area made up of older and deprived people and Councillor Bayunu wished to see the community improved.

The Planning Office stated that the previous Mind to Refuse decision was based on the scale and lack of parking. The Committee asked officers to identify reasons for refusal. A previous appeal had allowed a building of a similar scale and a reason could not be provided. 3 additional parking spaces for disabled people had been created on Camelford Close. Students are choosing where they want to live and are taking up family homes.

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

Councillor Lovecy stated that she had been present for other, previous applications on this site. Officers had stated that there were no grounds for a Mind to Refuse decision but Councillor Lovecy added that the area was not appropriate for a PBSA scheme. It was not a sustainable location for a mixed use of this kind. PBSA should be on sites where there would be no impact on residential neighbourhoods. Hopton Court has become a 50+ age group block and Manchester should allow for places that older people can remain in. In terms of the appeal against the previous decision, this was before the city council had confirmed their PBSA policy and the inspector will not have considered this policy in their decision. The impact of daylight and sunlight on adjacent buildings adds further weight against approving this development. Better sites were available and the sustained impact on this residential neighbourhood in addition to the scale and massing were grounds for the Committee to move a Mind to Refuse proposal.

Councillor Davies questioned whether the 20% reduced rate would be applied if the developer were to sell the building. She stated that she had lived in her building for 17 years with a north facing window, therefore having little natural light. To lose any more light, as would be the case for residents concerned here, would create an impact on health, energy bills and general wellbeing. This was a good location for older people who know their neighbours and enjoy life. The developer's suggestions on banning cars and late deliveries could not practically be implemented. In terms of the litter picking, while welcomed, shows that there is an expectation of increased litter problems and it was unlikely there would be litter picking early on a Sunday. Councillor Davies stated that she could not see this litter picking scheme working well. Residents already housed in this area enjoy living there and, whilst there was a need for students to free up housing stock for families, their lifestyles were often at odds with communities when mixed together

The Planning Officer stated that the 2008 decision was not based on PBSA but on scale and massing, which was more or less the same. A the Section 106 agreement was binding on the developer and any subsequent owner. It was residents who had identified existing litter problems that needed to be addressed. It was true that nobody could be stopped people from owning a car but students would not be allowed to have a residents parking permit. The issue of GP access is a problem across the city and the city council have many discussions about addressing this.

Councillor Curley stated that this was a difficult application of competing interests. Officers are working to the national framework, which should make decisions easier but for the concerns of residents and Ward Councillors. The council bought into the regeneration of Hulme for family lives and there was a commitment from people moving into the area. These competing pressures put the Committee in a position of having to have a full understanding of officer's and resident's viewpoints. Councillor Curley noted that some students come to Manchester, stay and contribute greatly to the city and the economy. The application here today was 2 storeys higher than the application from 2008. Councillor Curley concluded by stating that he was on the side of the residents as it was the right thing to do due to the potential for overlooking, shadowing, noise and parking issues. This way, it would be better for the communities in Hulme.

Councillor S Ali stated that he knew the site as a vacant eyesore for maybe 15 years. Previously, the application had been determined by the Committee with a Minded to Refuse decision due to parking issues and the height of the proposed development. Officers had been asked to take the application away and address these issues, which they had done and Councillor S Ali stated he would now support the application.

The Planning Officer addressed an earlier comment from Councillor Curley and confirmed that the current application was not for 2 extra storeys in height but was the same height as the 2008 application.

The Director of Planning stated that this was a very challenging application having its fourth appearance before the Committee. The application was not dismissive of issues surrounding the proposal and a very detailed report had been presented.

Having looked at a possible Minded to Refuse decision, it was deemed as not sustainable as the scale and parking had been addressed.

Councillor Johnson referred to the site designation in the report stating that this is the right site, yet it appeared that it was not and asked how this can be confirmed. The Planning Officer stated this was covered in the report under Planning Policy terms.

Councillor Lovecy proposed a Minded to Refuse decision due to a PBSA of this size being contrary to sustainable neighbourhoods. The city council's own PBSA policy does not mean that the Committee have to agree to approve this application. She added that this was not a suitable site.

Councillor Curley seconded the proposal.

The Director of Planning confirmed to all present that the Committee's decision was not a final determination but a deferral. The decision would be taken away to be determined whether the Committee's reason was suitable.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Refuse due to a PBSA of this size being contrary to sustainable neighbourhoods in keeping with the city council's PBSA Policy.

**PH/23/60      135028/FO/2022 & 135029/LO/2022 - Land Bound By King Street West, St Marys Parsonage, Garden Lane And Smithy Lane, Manchester, M3 2JP - Deansgate Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing for the erection of 14 storey office building and the refurbishment of the existing buildings at 3 Smithy Lane and Carriage Works on Garden Lane / St Mary's Parsonage. The Committee considered an application for LISTED BUILDING CONSENT for the demolition of 31-33 King Street West and the refurbishment of the existing buildings at 3 Smithy Lane and Carriage Works on Garden Lane / St Mary's Parsonage with ground floor extension. Consideration of this proposal was deferred at the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on 6 July 2023 to enable a site visit to take place.

The proposal is for 4,849 sqm of office floorspace and the retention and improvement of the Grade II Listed 3 Smithy Lane and the Carriage Works, following the demolition of part of the listed complex and other buildings on site. Objections have been received from Historic England and Save Britain's Heritage about the loss of 31-33 King Street West and the impact of the new build on the retained listed buildings and the surrounding Conservation Area. Application referenced 135029/LO/2022 will need to be referred to the Secretary of State for a decision if Members are minded to approve this proposal.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report.

The agent appreciated the concern over the demolition and noted that not much Victorian heritage survived World War II. The applicant had spent 4 years to find the best solution for the mix of heritage and development. Sustainability is key and this site would support Manchester's zero carbon emission strategy. There was an ongoing demand for workspaces in the city and new offices would support more jobs. This application would bring an underused site back into use and open up Garden Lane and Smithy Lane. The agent hoped that the Committee could support the application.

The Planning Officer stated that the building to be demolished had very little remaining heritage and was listed as part of a complex. The proposal is large but this supported the restoration of the remaining listed buildings.

The Chair of the Planning & Highways Committee noted that the retention of heritage aspects was welcomed and invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions.

Councillor Riasat stated that the site visit was very useful to understand the context of the building and the proposal and was happy to see this modernisation and confirmed he supported this application.

Councillor Curley agreed that the site visit was useful. Once on site he understood the poor condition of the building and could see the value of saving the two buildings at the rear. This application offered a good resolution.

Councillor Davies referred to the pictures supplied showing current and proposed images and asked for them to be taken from the same viewpoint in future. She inferred that this was not a strong heritage site and added that the site visit was very revealing in that it assisted the Committee members in understand the site. The 2 buildings to the rear were worth preserving and Councillor Davies felt that it would be nice for the public to be able to see, if just on Open Heritage days. The courtyard was also a great gain from the project.

Councillor S Ali moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to conditions within the report.

Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve for the application, subject to conditions set out in the report.

**PH/23/61     136874/FO/2023 - Echo Street, Manchester, M1 3QJ - Piccadilly Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing for erection of 3 interlinked towers of 27, 21 and 16 storeys together with intermediary link buildings (15 and 11 storeys) to form Purpose Built Student Accommodation (Sui Generis)

No objections had been received. MMU support the proposal.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this proposal included affordable student accommodation with 16% available at 80% of the market rate, secured via a Section 106 agreement that would bind the development and any successors.

The applicant stated that they were a leading provider and excited by the project on Echo Street. The scheme includes affordable accommodation. This was a high quality alternative to students living in HMOs and would free up housing stock.

The Planning Officer stated that this proposal essentially repurposed a previous approval for co-living and PBSA. It was now 100% student accommodation.

The Chair stated that this application would secure some affordable rental spaces for students which would be a positive outcome.

Councillor Curley concurred with the Chair's comments and noted that the development was made of the same sized units across the whole and this was welcomed.

Councillor Johnson stated that there was no concentration of large developments in this area. Piccadilly was growing but there was still a need for long term residents and the area was not established yet. Councillor Johnson asked if the cycle storage was under cover i.e., proper storage.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there was cycle storage inside and outside the building.

Councillor Kamal moved the officer's recommendation of Mind to Approve.

Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to be Mind to Approve for the application, subject to conditions set out in the report.

### **PH/23/62      136763/FO/2023 - Etihad Stadium (North Stand), Etihad Campus, Manchester, M11 3FF - Ancoats & Beswick Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing for alterations to the Etihad Stadium North Stand and adjoining land to provide an overall increase in Stadium capacity, hospitality, and concourse facilities available for use both during and outside of event days, an ancillary TV Studio (Sui Generis), a Roof-Walk Attraction (Use Class F1(c)) together with the erection of a 9 storey, 391 bed hotel (Use Class C1) with a further 10 suites provided within the North Stand of the Etihad Stadium for hotel or hospitality space (Use Class C1 / Sui Generis); restaurant at Level 1 (Use Class C1 / Class E), erection of an 8-storey building comprising: a new Club Shop and Ticket Office (Use Class E) at Ground and

Level 1, City Museum at Level 2, Leisure Attraction at Level 3 (Class F1(c)); and workspace (Class E) at Levels 4, 5, 6 and 7 and a new covered City Square fan zone and flexible event space with ground floor commercial, leisure, food and drink use (Use Class E and/ or drinking establishment (Sui Generis)) within each of the interrelated buildings adjoining the proposed square with associated landscaping and public realm works, servicing and access arrangements, and other associated works.

The proposal would extend the North Stand and include hospitality and concourse facilities which would also be available every day. Ancillary elements include a TV studio, roof walk attraction, 391 bed hotel, club shop and museum plus workspace for start ups and small businesses linked to the other users at the Campus. There would be a covered square forming an enhanced fan zone which would be supported by new food and beverage outlets. New public realm was proposed.

Lucy Powell MP (Manchester Central) supported the proposal. There had been 3 individual letters of support and 5 objections.

The Planning Officer did not add anything to the printed report.

The agent stated that the development involved over £300million of investment. It was a sustainable and world class proposal for a sports and leisure district which supports the economy and residents in East Manchester. The site would employ a 890 people over the construction period. £100million of supply chain expenditure and 3,000 jobs would also be created. The site would inject £70million into Manchester's economy and offer training and recruitment opportunities for local people. It would be a destination for football fans and other communities. The increased capacity at the Etihad as part of this development had been a relevant consideration. The scheme was future proofed and had been collaborated on with all stakeholders. This project also supports ambitions for net zero carbon by 2030.

The Planning Officer noted that all the agent's comments were within the report.

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

Councillor Hughes stated that he was a lifelong Manchester City supporter and felt that this was a great scheme for East Manchester. He noted that the club were staying in East Manchester for the long haul and the additional jobs provided by this development were much needed.

Councillor Riasat stated that this was a commercial investment that has transformed the area and added that this was the next step on that journey. Councillor Riasat spoke of his support for this application.

Councillor Curley added his support and stated that he was a fan of Manchester City's approach, naming Pete Bradshaw as a hard worker and congratulating the club on their work with apprenticeships which produced high quality opportunities.

Councillor Kamal moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve for the application.

Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve for the application, subject to conditions set out in the report.

### **PH/23/63 Confirmation The Manchester City Council (Land at Sherwood Street & Wynnstay Grove) Tree Preservation Order 2023 - Old Moat Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing concerning the background and issues involved in the making of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on 18 April 2023 and to recommend the confirmation of this Tree Preservation Order.

The Director of Planning recommends that the Planning and Highways Committee instruct the City Solicitor to confirm the Tree Preservation Order on land at Wynnstay Grove/Sherwood Street, under Section 199 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and that the Order should cover the woodland as plotted T1 on the plan attached to this report.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the printed report.

An objector addressed the Committee, stating that he was here as Head of Estate Management for the charity, Railway Paths who own this land and 350km of other property attached to disused railway lines, lots of which are public access, such as Manchester's Fallowfield Loop Line which adjoins this site. This was in conjunction with sister charity group, Sustrans.

The charity do not receive external funding so rely on construction projects on and around their sites. The charity needed to generate £750,000/£1million per year to keep running. The objector expressed his concern at how this TPO had been brought forward. No trees were at risk and there was a proposal made to the city council for potential social housing on this site. He believed the TPO application was flawed stating "one high quality tree" but added that this was not high quality woodland, and not accessible to the public. The site was used for fly-tipping, ASB and attracted rats and, regarding its visual amenity, its value was questionable. The charity had not had any discussions with the city council on this piece of land and the TPO may halt some much needed development. The TPO was premature and this site could be enhanced via the planning process. There was access to the Fallowfield Loop Line through Sherwood Street. Sustrans would like to enhance this area and the city council were supportive but unable to fund. Confirmation of this TPO would make any enhancements more expensive to deliver which would be contrary to aims of the charities efforts for the loop line and for the benefit of the public. In his closing statement, the objector requested that the Committee do not confirm this TPO and stated his desire to engage with the council on a proposal for social housing.

The Planning Officer stated that this process had been difficult. An arborist had been consulted and found 1 good quality tree on site. The application may have been pre-emptive to have control over what happens with the site in future. The Planning Team would work with the charity to give the trees any credence that may be deserved.

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

Councillor Curley stated that this was an unusual TPO that could stop development on a brownfield site. It was the first time Councillor Curley could recall that a TPO did not feel necessary and he expressed the need to have discussions.

Councillor Riasat enquired as to why there had been a TPO over a piece of land, how many trees were on the site and why the site was chosen.

The Planning Officer stated that this TPO came from a number of agents/consultants who felt the site was being marketed. This was a former railway site with some trees of scale and the general setting had been taken into account. The arborist's view was that there was a group value to the site. The council would have control over any development in future and were willing to speak with charities, having not had that approach previously for this site.

Councillor Lovecy stated that she was generally supportive of saving trees and groups of trees. She asked, if supportive of the TPO, how could someone propose to use the land for a worthy project, such as affordable housing.

The Director of Planning stated that there were numerous approaches and that a TPO does not preclude developers if the benefit of the scheme is seen as more worthy than the scheme could be approved.

Councillor Lovecy was satisfied that she could support the recommendation after hearing the Director's comments.

Councillor Curley stated that the Committee may need to know if the land is included in development land pockets as, if there was a housing partner interested, they would have to back away from any project if the site was not within a developmental plot. Councillor Curley felt that the Committee would need to see partnership out of courtesy and accountability and asked how urgent a decision was and whether this could come back to the next Planning & Highways meeting. Councillor Curley then moved to defer the application.

The Director of Planning stated that there was a set period to confirm a TPO and made checks with Planning Team members. Following making checks, the Director stated that the TPO would have to be determined at the next Committee meeting on 31 August 2023.

Councillor S Ali seconded Councillor Curley's deferral proposal.

## **Decision**



To defer the TPO until the next Committee meeting on 31 August 2023.