

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2024

Present: Councillor Lyons - In the Chair

Councillors: S. Ali, Andrews, Chohan, Curley, Davies, Gartside, Hassan, Hewitson, Hughes, Kamal, Lovecy, Riasat

Also present: Councillors Abdullatif, Muse, Bayunu, Igbon, Doswell and Ilyas

PH/24/01 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 137399/FO/2023, 137401/FO/2023, 130387/FO/2021 and 138302/FO/2023.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/24/02 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 14 December 2023 as a correct record.

PH/24/03 137399/FO/2023 - Land bounded by Upper Brook Street, Cottenham Street and Kincardine Road, Manchester, M13 9TD - Ardwick Ward & 137401/FO/2023 - Land between Upper Brook Street, Kincardine Road and Grosvenor Street Manchester - Ardwick Ward

The Committee considered the reports of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding:

137399/FO/2023 - the erection of a 6 to 9 storey building for Sci-Tech use (Use Class E (g)(ii)) and 265sqm of a cafe/bar (Use Class E (b)), and a 9 to 23 storey building for Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) (Use Sui Generis), comprising 737 bedrooms and 293sqm of community use (Use Class F2 (b)) and 80sqm of commercial floorspace (Use Class E), alongside new public realm, access, parking, and associated works following demolition of existing buildings.

Consideration of this application was deferred by the Planning and Highways Committee on 14 December 2023 to enable a site visit to take place.

The Government published, an updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 19 December 2023. The assessment of the issues and matters arising from the application set out in the report remained valid as a result of the publication of the

updated NPPF and the recommendation set out at the end of the report remained unchanged as a result.

114 objections (from 78 households) had been received. Councillors Muse and Abdullatif object.

And:

137401/FO/2023 - Full planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of three 12/14/29 storey buildings to be used for Purpose Built Student Accommodation (Use Sui Generis), comprising 983 bedrooms in total and 506sqm of ground floor ancillary uses (café/commercial and convenience store - Use Classes E (a)/(b)/(c)), three buildings comprising 5/7/9 storeys for Science and Innovation uses (Use Class E (g)(i) & (ii)) and 834sqm ground floor community uses (retail/ cafés and medical facility (Use Classes E (a)/(b) and (e)), and the provision of new public realm, two new public squares, new access and parking, and associated works.

Consideration of this application was deferred by the Planning and Highways Committee on 14 December 2023 to enable a site visit to take place.

The Government published, an updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 19 December 2023. The assessment of the issues and matters arising from the application set out in the report remained valid as a result of the publication of the updated NPPF and the recommendation set out at the end of the report remained unchanged as a result.

Manchester Metropolitan University supported the proposal.

113 (from 76 households) objections were received during the first round of notification, 97 (from 77 households) had been received. Councillors Muse and Abdullatif object.

Officers noted that a letter of support had been received from the Growth Company that felt the application presented an opportunity for an exciting platform which would benefit the area for many years. Committee members had been on a site visit on the day of the meeting which focused on the tallest element of the application, at 29-storeys near Grosvenor Street, and its impact on nearby accommodation on Hamsworth Close. On the visit, members stopped opposite Elizabeth Yarwood to see another taller element on Upper Brook Street with the lower element closer to Kincardine Court. Members noted the proximity to homes on the opposite side to Kincardine Court. The visit stopped at Gartside gardens, noting the proximity of buildings to road frontages and therefore the community. Members asked questions during the visit that were answered by Officers.

The Planning Officer noted that the Council's main priority was to deliver commercial space, and the application offered 650,000 square feet. Life sciences are one of the key growth sectors and the opportunity to commercialise that was only available in a small area, mainly around the University. To deliver that space, the application needed to provide an enabling use, which for this was PBSA, which was desperately needed in Manchester. The size of the scheme had reduced considerably. Originally

the application was for a 42-storey building but was now 29 storey following work by officers. The application had been independently tested and that was satisfied the application was not excessive and was the amount required to deliver the commercial floor space.

Two objectors addressed the Committee. The first objector raised concerns that the development would be towering, removing day light for nearby residential property. The objectors felt this was a residential area for families and that they had been told the area would be a thriving community, not a Life Science campus. It was felt that students would not move out of HMO's as PBSA was too expensive.

The second objector had similar concerns regarding the size of the application and the negative impact on residents. They felt the application would overshadow the nearby park and residential properties. They had concerns regarding a possible increase in pollution. The resident felt there was not enough sunlight in the area, and this would remove it even further. The resident felt Councillors had a lead role in looking after residential communities and requested that the application was refused.

Two applicants addressed the Committee for each application. The first stated that the applicant was investing £730 million into the area having consulted extensively and listened to the Community. The scheme had been amended to the minimum required to deliver the Life Sciences space. Nearby car parks have low occupancy levels that can be used if necessary. They noted that the local community had requested certain amenities, such as a GP surgery, which was included in the application.

The second agent noted that the applications would deliver PBSA and a leading Life Science building. Whilst this was the only suitable location, this was also the correct location. The applicant wanted to play an active role in the community. The scheme was to provide 500 Life Science jobs once completed, with 800 during the delivery of the project.

A ward Councillor addressed the Committee stating that this was an area of family homes and a tight knit community. They felt the application did not match that. The Councillor felt that the area did not need the amount of students proposed in the application. They did not believe the application would enhance any part of resident's lives. They felt the application would increase traffic and commuters in an already busy area. The application would overshadow homes, as well as green spaces.

A second ward Councillor addressed the Committee, hoping that the site visit had provided members with a clearer idea of their objections. They noted that it had been the 10 years anniversary of the Brunswick redevelopment, and that this application would have a detrimental impact on that redevelopment. They had raised consistent objections, noting a lack of parking for 5,000 people, the height of the building, and loss of light and overshadowing. They felt that there was already PBSA around, with more already approved so questioned the need for this scheme. They raised issues relating to the viability of this scheme. The ward Councillor felt the development was not suitable for the area.

The Planning Officer stated that 2 comprehensive reports addressed the issues raised. It had never been suggested that there would not be a substantial impact on the area. All impacts had to be properly tested, with all impacts set out in the reports. The application had been fully considered and that formed the basis of Officer's recommendation.

The Planning Officer noted there had been comments regarding PBSA and what it achieves, with suggestions that it did not lead to students moving out of mainstream accommodation and HMO's. They noted that in South Manchester, Council tax exemptions had dropped by 31%, meaning 670 homes had been taken out of student use. In the City Centre, council tax exemptions had flatlined but the number of students living in the centre had increased by 4,000, highlighting that most of those students were living in PBSA. In Ardwick, in the previous 10 years there had been 2,000 more students living in the area but only 200 PBSA spaces built so students were living in mainstream accommodation or HMO's. Without PBSA, those numbers would continue to rise.

In terms of Public Realm, there were 3 significant areas proposed as part of scheme, with 3 generous routes linking Brunswick and Upper Brook Street through the site that were landscaped with seating throughout.

The Planning Officer stated that there was no parking with scheme, but it is Council policy to reduce car journeys and increase public transport use. To provide parking as part of the scheme would not encourage that. They did also note that there were 3 car parks within a 10-minute walk of site that operated well below occupancy levels.

The Planning Officer stated that the impact of overshadowing was set out in both reports and had not been ignored. They were not suggesting that there would be no impact, but assessments had shown that the impact would not be significant.

Following persistent interruption from the public gallery, at this stage the Chair requested that the meeting being adjourned whilst the public gallery was cleared. The Committee restarted in the Antechamber.

The Planning Officer continued that in terms of viability, this was a large and complex scheme, that in total was over 2 hectares. As the proposal was not just Life Sciences, it had to be tested how much of enabling development was necessary to deliver the scheme. An Independent Party had assessed the proposal and agreed that the level of PBSA was required to deliver the 650,000 square feet of commercial space.

In terms of rights of light, the Planning Officer stated that was a private matter and could not be assessed in the Planning process. During that process, the impact on day light, sun light and overshadowing are all assessed and that was set out in the report.

The Chair moved on to taking questions from members, grouping questions together. A member questioned if the scheme could not be built or maintained without the subsidy of the PBSA, and if so, why that was the case. A member also queried if there was any provision for highway adaptations within the applications due to the increased population they would bring. A member then questioned how the

developer would have an active role in the community, as had been suggested. They did not see how residents wants were being met by the applications.

The Planning Officer noted that the viability assessment had shown the requirement for a subsidy, but that subsidy was from the developer and not students. In terms of Upper Brook Street, thousands of students cross over there every day to get to the University as a third of Ardwick population are already students. One of the public crossings was to be enhanced as part of the application but if there were safety issues, the highways authority would already have been aware. The Planning Officer felt it important to remember that students were also residents and part of the communities that they live in. The proposal included retail units to benefit the Community, with the developer having attempted to get a Lidl supermarket but Lidl were not interested at the time. There was to be a community centre, and medical centre along with 3 major pieces of public realm with 3 wide, landscaped routes.

A member queried to what extent a different model was feasible where a subsidy would not be needed. A member questioned how it would be made sure that the local retail would be for local residents rather than takeaway outlets aimed at students.

Councillor S. Ali moved the Officer's recommendation for both applications.

The Planning Officer was invited to respond to the member queries prior to the moving of Officer recommendations. The Planning Officer reminded the Committee that they had to make decisions on planning policies. This site was seen as complex, with the application across 2 hectares which was larger than usual applications. The only viable way to deliver the proposal was using enabling development of PBSA of this scale. The data showed where students want to live, which was close to the Universities. The evidence showed that when PBSA is available, students move out of family homes and HMOs into the PBSA. The Planning Officer accepted that students were a transient population, but they wanted to free up homes to be occupied by permanent residents. The developer had engaged with the community to establish what types of retail units they wanted in the space created by the application. Whilst it could not be confirmed the type of retail that would be there, the Planning Officer felt that the developer wanted retail to serve the residents.

A member continued to query why the scheme was not profitable and did not understand the need for a subsidy. A member then questioned how deliveries to the PBSA would be managed. A member also noted that a recent report stated that students from Manchester were travelling to other cities for university.

The Director of Planning noted that students were staying outside Manchester due to not being able to get any accommodation. They reminded the Committee that they had to form a decision based on current planning policy.

The Planning Officer repeated that in relation to the need for a subsidy, that was what the viability assessment had shown. Strategies were also proposed within the report for dealing with moving in and out, and managing deliveries, with conditions proposed to support that.

As Councillor S. Ali had moved the Officer's recommendation for both applications earlier, at this point, Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve both applications subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement to secure the provision of affordable rented accommodation, a mechanism to secure the delivery of the employment building, that private waste collections would take place for the perpetuity of the development and secure the project architect.

PH/24/04 138126/00/2023 - University of Manchester Fallowfield Campus Wilmslow Road, Manchester M14 6HD - Fallowfield Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding an outline planning application (with access only in detail) for the phased demolition of existing buildings and phased development of up to 3,300 Purpose Built Student Accommodation bedrooms (Sui Generis use class) with associated facilities including waste storage, laundry and cycle storage; up to 4,500 sq m of floorspace to be used for ancillary purposes associated with the student residential use of the site within Use Class F1a, Class E(a), E(b), E(c), E(d), E(g), Sui Generis (drinking establishment and hot food takeaway); ancillary supporting staff accommodation (up to 55 bedrooms) (Sui Generis use class), and up to 1,200 sq m of ancillary residential dwellings (Use Class C3), plus associated car parking, hard and soft landscaping, open space, utilities, footpaths and roads.

The application related to the redevelopment of part of the University of Manchester student halls of residence at its Fallowfield Campus within the Fallowfield ward. Planning permission had previously been granted for its demolition and redevelopment as part of a wider scheme to provide additional bedspaces at the Campus. The application sought to update the University's proposals to modernise the campus and provide further additional capacity at the site to address the need within the City for further purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA).

The Government published, an updated National Planning Policy Framework NPPF) on 19 December 2023. The assessment of the issues and matters arising from the application set out in the report remained valid as a result of the publication of the updated NPPF and the recommendation set out at the end of the report remained unchanged as a result.

The Planning Officer had nothing to add to the report.

An objector noted that they had lived in the area for 24 years. They felt Fallowfield to be struggling with the number of people there. There were already issues with litter. The University of Manchester only guaranteed PBSA for students in their first year. The objector did not believe that this application would free up family homes and felt there was no evidence to support that it would. They felt the application was an overdevelopment of the site. They had concerns about carbon emissions and the effect of those on children, the elderly and the most vulnerable.

The agent, noted that this was an outline application with strict limits contained within that, such as having declared the maximum number of beds, the maximum height of the scheme and the areas that must be free from development and the points of access that were fixed in the application. The agent felt that the outline application allowed for Officers to make a full assessment of the scheme. The agent noted that it was desirable to increase the student population of Manchester but to do that, extra PBSA was required. Prices were to be purposely set at a competitive rate, typically 30% cheaper than what was available elsewhere. The agent noted that PBSA was necessary to move students out of residential homes and HMOs, as supported by the evidence. Fallowfield remained a popular location for students. The scheme had been designed to be zero carbon emissions in operation and achieve a net-gain of 20% in biodiversity, which was a university standard. The university had been involved in extensive engagement with the neighbourhood team in Fallowfield to put long-term support into the area.

A ward Councillor accepted that issues would be easier to manage whilst students were in PBSA. They accepted that the area was marketed for students to move into but did not believe the application would free up HMOs and family homes. The ward Councillor noted that a previous application in the area was refused on appeal due to that application bringing an extra 425 students to the area and the impact that would have. They noted the application being considered by members was for over 3,000 bedrooms. They felt that it was long-term residents who would be impacted most by the application.

A second ward Councillor addressed the Committee, stating their belief that this was an overdevelopment. They wanted residents to be considered and did not believe they had been as part of this. They felt the application had not considered whether the site was suitable for PBSA. The ward Councillor did not believe that PBSA would free up family homes and HMOs.

The Planning Officer noted that the report before members addressed the issues that had been raised. They stated that there were clear parameters to approve the scheme contained within the report. The Planning Officer was aware of the need to provide family homes in Fallowfield and stated that without PBSA, students would continue to take up those family homes. The university had agreed a programme of work with the neighbourhood team in Fallowfield for the short and long term.

A member queried if the Planning Officer had details on the number of students who had moved out of HMO's. A member asked what percentage of the rooms in the application would be for second- and third-year students.

The Planning Officer stated that the council tax exemptions data from their housing colleagues provided the data regarding students moving into PBSA and away from HMO's. They noted that approving the outline application did not constrain the Committee but set a limit on what can be proposed in subsequent applications, such as the number of bedrooms and height of the building.

A member queried what the drawback was for students not in their first year. Another member asked that the developer works closely with the neighbourhood teams to improve their offer to the community.

The Planning Officer noted that they could not control through the Planning process whether second- and third-year students live in the building. They had discussed the possibility of reserving places for those students with the university. The Planning Officer stated that discussions were already underway between the developer and neighbourhood teams.

Councillor Andrews moved the Officer's recommendation to Approve.

Councillor Davies seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Approve the application.

PH/24/05 130387/FO/2021 - 130387/FO/2021 - The Former Gamecock Public House Boundary Lane Manchester M15 6GE

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of a part 7, part 9 storey purpose-built student accommodation building comprising 146 bed spaces (Sui Generis use class) with ancillary amenity space, a ground floor community hub (proposed for Use Classes F2(b), E(b), E (3), E(f)) and associated landscape works and infrastructure.

A scheme was reported to Planning and Highways Committee on the 16 November 2023 for a part 7, part 9 storey PBSA building providing 146 bed spaces. The Committee were 'minded to refuse' on the basis that PBSA of that size would have been contrary to maintaining a sustainable mixed residential neighbourhood and would lead to an imbalance of students living in the area. The planning policy context for this proposal was set out clearly in the section of the report with the subheading 'Policies'. That part of the report addresses all the policies that were relevant to the determination of the application. As had been set out in previous reports, officers did not consider that there was a policy-based reason to refuse this proposal.

There were 22 objections to the latest scheme, one expression of support and two neutral comments.

The Planning Officer stated that a letter of objection had been received from the Guinness Partnership on behalf of Cooper House residents, drawing particular attention to issues associated with the parking spaces for disabled people on Camelford Close, land they believe was not a public highway. The Council is a freeholder of the land on Camelford Close, providing a lease to the Guinness Trust but applicant would have a legal right to access the parking spaces. The Planning Officer noted that 31 objections from when the item was last before the Committee had been missed off this most recent report.

An objector stated that the development would have a profound impact on daylight and be overbearing on Cooper House. They felt there would be insufficient parking and loading, that would lead to further traffic congestion. They believed the

application to be a far denser development than others in the area. They felt the development threatened residents' quality of life.

A second objector noted that they had been consistent in stating that this development was inappropriate for the area. The proposed development would overlook children's bedrooms. They felt the offer of a Community Hub from the developer to be insulting and asked the Committee to refuse the application.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee, stating that this would be a high quality, sustainable development. They felt there was a pressing need for PBSA in Manchester and that this site was currently a blight on the local area. The proposed site was 500 metres from the University of Manchester and 200 metres from Manchester Metropolitan University. The proposed PBSA would offer a variety of accommodation, in-line with the offer of a typical PBSA and will provide disabled parking and a Community Hub. The proposal was in-line with other buildings in the area with the reduced scale and mass.

A ward Councillor addressed the Committee, stating that this was the time to finally refuse the application. They felt the proposal did nothing to address their concerns and had provided no evidence of the need for PBSA on this site. They felt the application would bring disruption to a settled residential area, failing to consider the health and wellbeing of residents. They felt that the trees proposed to be planted would not have sufficient light. The Councillor felt that the rooms offered were below the required standard.

A second ward Councillor addressed the Committee, stating that nothing had changed. They had objected on every occasion the application had been before the Committee. The application was in a residential area and students already living in the area had had a negative impact.

The Planning Officer noted that the applicant had amended the application on three occasions. The Planning Officer could find no policy-based reason to refuse the application based on the reason the Committee had been previously minded to refuse, on the basis that PBSA of this size would be contrary to maintaining a sustainable mixed residential neighbourhood and would lead to an imbalance of students living in the area.

A member stated that they thought a different reason for minded to refuse had been given at the previous meeting, relating to the size of the scheme. They felt the application did not fit with the Oxford Road Regeneration Scheme. They wanted to propose refusal based on the size of the scheme and policy H12.

The Director of Planning informed members that there was clear protocol relating to minded to refuse. When members are minded to refuse, Planning officers take that away to try to find a reason for refusal. Previously, the applicant had amended the scheme based on the reasons that members had been minded to refuse. At the previous meeting the reason for minded to refuse was that PBSA of this size would be contrary to maintaining a sustainable mixed residential neighbourhood and would lead to an imbalance of students living in the area, and not the height of the scheme.

If members wanted to change the reason, then they would have to be minded to refuse again rather than being able to propose refusal.

A member then stated that they would second the proposal if amended to minded to refuse on the basis of Policy H12.

A member then stated their belief that it would be disingenuous to be minded to refuse again, feeling that a decision was necessary. They queried how the vote would work.

The Director of Planning and the City Solicitor's representative informed the committee that if a motion is defeated, then another motion would need to be proposed for a decision. The same motion could not be moved twice.

Councillor Lovecy moved minded to refuse on the basis of Policy H12. Councillor Curley seconded the proposal. The proposal was defeated, with three members in favour, nine against and two abstentions.

Councillor S. Ali moved the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Chohan seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve subject to a legal agreement containing affordable rent obligations for up to 20% of all bed spaces being advertised as being below market rent level in each academic year.

PH/24/06 138302/FO/2023 - 1 Park Place Manchester M4 4EZ

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of a part 25 and part 15 storey residential building comprising 154 apartments (Use Class C3a) with ground floor commercial uses (Use Class E), together with associated residents amenity space, cycle parking, substation, servicing, and associated landscaping works following demolition of existing buildings.

The proposal would create 154 homes, of which up to 20% would be affordable (shared ownership), with commercial space in a part 15, part 25 storey building. There would be public realm, parking for disabled residents and a loading bay.

Six objections had been received.

The Planning Officer report incorrectly stated that the affordable housing as part of the application was to be shared ownership, but it would be discounted market sales at 80% of market rates.

The applicant attended and addressed the Committee, noting that they had been a Manchester resident for a long time and had made a high-quality application

containing 20% affordable housing. The application provided commercial space whilst also aligning with the zero carbon aims of the city.

Councillor Riasat noted that the report was detailed and was happy to move the Officer's recommendation.

A member had concerns regarding the design of the application, with white buildings often becoming stained.

The Planning Officer stated that there were lots of white buildings that were not stained. When designed correctly, white buildings will remain white. The application had employed an experienced architect.

Councillor S. Ali seconded the proposal of Councillor Riasat to move the Officer's recommendation.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve subject to the signing of a legal agreement to secure 20% affordable housing and to secure the use of the project architect.

PH/24/07 137657/FO/2023 - 27-29 Middleton Road Manchester M8 5DT

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of two storey building (with basement) to form synagogue (Class F.1) following demolition of existing building, together with associated parking and landscaping.

The application related to a pair of semi-detached dwellinghouses which had been subdivided into flats. Consent is sought for the erection of a two-storey building (with basement) to form a synagogue (Class F.1) following demolition of existing building, together with associated parking and landscaping. The application site is located within the Crumpsall Lane Conservation Area.

7 objections and 103 emails of support had been received.

The Planning Officer stated that if members were to agree the recommendation of Officers, they would ask for one additional condition regarding another bat survey taking place before demolition of the building.

An objector attended and addressed the Committee, noting the proposal to demolish two houses and replace with a religious centre. The houses are part of a conservation area and were part of the reason why there is a conservation area in the first place. The objector could not see the justification for demolishing the properties. They raised concerns regarding traffic, noting the site is between two sets of traffic lights with congestion issues already apparent. They felt the application would make the congestion issues worse.

The applicant attended and addressed the Committee, accepting that it was a conservation area. The application had been in process for two years to ensure that the design addressed the needs of the area. They noted that they would not be able to keep the building as it was, and that the application brought less than substantial harm. Issues relating to traffic and parking had been addressed in the report, noting that the building was for an Orthodox religious community who were prohibited from driving on the days they visited the centre.

The Planning Officer accepted that it was regrettable to lose a building in a conservation area but it has been fully explored with the applicant whether it was possible to reuse the existing building or retain the frontage but it was accepted that the proposed scheme was an appropriate design and that there would be less than substantial harm with the public benefits outweighing any limited harm. The Planning Officer was satisfied that users of the centre would walk and not drive.

A member queried if the building was still in use as housing.

The Planning Officer stated that the building was in use as apartments, owned by the applicant. There was a condition that the applicant would assist those living in the apartments with relocation.

A member questioned if there would be a pressure on timing relating to that relocation.

The Planning Officer stated that the condition would include time scales to relocate existing tenants.

Councillor Riasat moved the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor S. Ali seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve (subject to statutory notices lapsing and no new issues being raised).

PH/24/08 138294/FO/2023 - Land At Plymouth Grove Manchester

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of a part six storey, part eight storey building for use as purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA) (Sui Generis) comprising 263 bed spaces, with associated amenity space, cycle parking, external landscaping, access, and other associated works.

6 objections had been received.

The Planning Officer recommended a further condition should the Committee be Minded to Approve, to agree details of boundary treatment.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee, stating that there had been extensive engagement regarding the application from the outset. The application would reuse a vacant brownfield site. The agent stated that there was a clear need for additional student accommodation in Manchester. The agent stated that the application met Policy H12. The application would provide economic and regeneration benefits, bringing construction jobs that would be targeted at Manchester residents. They noted there had been no objections from statutory consultees.

Councillor Hewitson proposed a site visit, noting that the proposed site was facing a children's nursery and would overshadow nearby buildings.

Councillor Curley seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve the motion for a site visit in order to investigate the potential impact of overshadowing on nearby buildings and the impact on the nearby children's nursery.