

## **Minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2023**

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

**Councillors:** Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Chohan, Curley, Davies, Gartside, Hassan, Hewitson, Hughes, Johnson, Kamal and Lovecy

**Apologies:** Councillors, Ludford, Lyons and Riasat

**Also present:** Councillors Kilpatrick and Leech.

### **PH/23/72     Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding application 137462/FO/2023.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

### **PH/23/73     Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 31 August 2023 as a correct record.

### **PH/23/74     136444/FH/2023 - 1A Cavendish Road, Manchester, M20 1JG - Didsbury West Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of new front porch, erection of single storey rear extension to form garage with terraced area above following excavation of section of existing rear courtyard, and erection of fencing above existing walls around perimeter of the site; following demolition of part of boundary wall.

The property sits within the Albert Park Conservation Area but is not listed.

One representation in support of the scheme was received from a Local Councillor. The key issues for consideration are the potential impact on highway and pedestrian safety which would arise as a consequence of the removal of part of the boundary wall allowing access to the rear yard of the application property for parking; potential impacts on neighbouring occupiers due to any overbearing appearance as well as the impact on the character of the Conservation Area. These issues are fully considered within the main body of the report.

The applicant addressed the Committee and stated that parking was limited in their surrounding area and this had been raised by many residents and Ward Councillors. New developments were exacerbating this concern. The nearest parking place to the property was some 50 metres away. This scheme would provide an extra space for the community if approved. There are other identical schemes on the same road.

Visibility requirements are imposed on the alleyway which is used by other vehicles to access Cavendish Road. The report stated that the alleyway was not suitable for vehicular access but large vehicles are able to manoeuvre in and out. The report had also stated that the scheme was intrusive to neighbours but the corner shop and other neighbour feel that it is not detrimental. The Planning Team had not worked with the applicant and had used unsuitable documentation and the applicant felt there had been a lack of transparency. A freedom of information request had been refused. This was expressed as absurd as it did not allow the applicant to know how to follow the process.

Ward Councillor Kilpatrick addressed the Committee and stated that it was unusual for this size of application to come to the Committee. The Community was crying out for operational housing. Councillor Kilpatrick was surprised to see the officer's recommendation of Refuse for this application and expected more discussions to have taken place. The reasons for refusal were unusual. Councillor Kilpatrick wanted to see some consistency. Regarding conservation grounds, Councillor Kilpatrick was passionate about this in West Didsbury. Planning and Highways could have worked with the applicant. It was outrageous to refuse when there is already a garage down the alleyway. There was a need to address the main issue which was to build a suitable family house rather than lose one.

Ward Member, Councillor Leech addressed the Committee and stated that this was a complex application. There were some positive notes and he thanked the Planning and Highways team for presenting this application to the Committee rather than using delegated powers where it may have been refused without any hearing. Councillor Leech supported the application and he expressed his opinion that it had not been handled adequately by the Planning and Highways team. Councillor Leech referred to the report to address his considerations on why the application should be approved referring to MCC being responsible for making sure residents and businesses kept bins on their property, the entrance not impacting on the street scene, the wall height already increasing along the alleyway, neighbours at 1 and 1b being in support of the application, the current wall having been built without planning permission, that it was crazy for the dismantling of this wall to require permission, that the garage at the end of the alleyway was being used daily, that there was already a dropped kerb in place for the alleyway and referred to a nearby application at 4 Cavendish Road. This application would have no negative impact on the conservation area and Councillor Leech urged Members to approve this development and avoid an appeal which he would support.

The Planning Officer addressed key points raised, stating that there were many issues. The scheme had to be assessed on its own merits. Confirmation was provided that the alleyway wall was lawful and would require permission to demolish. The Highways impact on this side of the road was concerning as it was adjacent to a primary school with yellow road markings. The narrow aspect of the alleyway itself and extra usage if approved was a concern. The fence on the top of the boundary was not in keeping with the area. There were no objections to plans at the frontage of the application property but the rear plans were not permissible and was unacceptable to the street scene.

The Chair asked if all relevant information had been checked in the report and the Planning Officer stated that the scheme had been fully assessed.

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

Councillor Lovecy stated that she knew the area and was seeking clarity on the legal standing regarding the yellow marking associated with the adjacent primary school.

The Highways Officer confirmed that they were school keep clear markings which one could drive over for access purposes but drivers were not permitted to wait on them.

Councillor Lovecy expressed that safety for the pupils of the school was important.

Councillor Johnson noted that there were similar developments nearby and asked why there was an increased risk if the alleyway was already used for access for vehicles to a garage.

The Planning Officer stated that there were no powers to close the garage but any additional vehicular movements in the alleyway were of concern and added that this application had to be assessed on its own merits.

Councillor Lovecy addressed the area of the report showing the fencing that had been deemed unacceptable.

The Planning Officer concurred and stated that it was a visual intrusion.

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

Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

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

### **PH/23/75     137462/FO/2023 - Land Off Parkmount Road, Manchester, M9 4AJ - Harpurhey Ward**

The proposed application relates to the erection of a 2 storey residential development (including accommodation to roof-space) comprising 24 affordable dwellinghouses consisting of 18 townhouses and 6 apartments, together with associated access works, landscaping, parking and boundary treatment.

Following notification of the application, 25 representations have been received, including 24 objections and 1 in support, with comments. A representation objecting to the development has also been received from Parkmount Residents' Association.

The proposed development forms part of the first phase of Project 500, which seeks

to provide 378 new, low carbon affordable homes on 27 sites owned by the Council across the city. Many of the sites are located in north and east Manchester and new development would respond to high demand for affordable housing.

Project 500 is being delivered by registered providers. In this case, the applicant is Mosscafe St Vincent's Housing Group (MSV) - a registered social landlord who own and manage almost 9,000 properties in Greater Manchester, Lancashire and West Yorkshire.

MSV aspire to assist those struggling to find a decent home, the elderly, those on low incomes and those in need of specialist housing.

The Planning Officer referred to an updated transport note which was dealt with by way of a Highways works condition.

The Chair gave comments referring to rentals and the Local Government Housing Allowance, noting that there were 16 affordable rentals and 8 to buy at affordable cost and confirmed that the local authority has an allowance.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this was correct and in accordance with the definitions of an Affordable Rental scheme.

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

Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

Councillor Johnson sought some clarity on the application, whilst not opposing it. She requested information on the off-street parking bays and whether they were retained for the use of residents or available to all. Also, Councillor Johnson had concerns around the loss of green space and asked the Planning Team were seeking to replace trees and enhance the area. She also requested information on the low-carbon heating and whether they would be better for the environment.

The Planning Officer confirmed that each dwelling had its own parking space and 5 more on-street parking spaces. The loss of green space had been balanced with the offer of affordable housing on the site. There would be biodiversity improvements and other green space nearby also helped to outweigh any detrimental effect of the loss of green space.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to approve the Application for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the report.