

## Planning and Highways Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 30 May 2024

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

**Councillors:** S. Ali, L. Bell, Chohan, Curley, Davies, Gartside, Hassan, Hewitson, Hughes, Kamal, Kilpatrick, Lovecy and Riasat.

**Also present:** Councillors Benham, Grimshaw, Hitchen and Richards

#### **PH/24/23      Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 138805/FO/2023, 138788/FO/2023, 137994/FO/2023 and Confirmation of The Manchester City Council (Land at Ashfell Court, Chorlton) Tree Preservation Order 2023.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/24/24      Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2024 as a correct record.

#### **PH/24/25      138805/FO/2023 - 2 Gloucester Street, Manchester, M1 5QR - Deansgate Ward**

The Committee considered the report regarding partial demolition of the former Hotspur Press and development of a part 4/5-storey and part 37-storey building to provide Purpose Built Student Accommodation (Sui Generis Use Class) with ground floor commercial or community uses (Use Classes F(e), F2(a)(b) and E(b)).

8 objections (including 1 on behalf of 6 residents) had been received. MMU do not support the application. A letter of support had been received from Macintosh Village Management.

The Planning Officer referred the Committee to the officer's recommendation in the report, which was minded to approve, subject to a Section 106 agreement around affordable student accommodation and a waste strategy plus, resolving the concerns of the Environmental Agency.

The applicant stated that saving and restoring this historic building, which is in a state of disrepair, was important for Manchester's heritage. The plans would preserve many of the old features and add a public square, open to the community. It would enhance wildlife and the River Medlock. 10% of units would be affordable. The developer believed that the proposal had the support of local neighbours and

residents. The scheme will contribute to the neighbourhood and safeguard the character of this area.

Councillor Curley enquired about the discounted rent offer. The Planning Officer stated that, as this is PBSA the rent test did not apply and confirmed that 10% of the dwellings would be available at 80%.

Councillor Kilpatrick enquired about the objection from Environmental Agency regarding their concerns around a flood zone. Councillor Gartside requested for the square metreage of the public realm to be confirmed.

The Planning Officer stated that the Environmental Agency had no objection to a similar scheme in 2018. This is a technical matter that would need to be resolved. The Environmental Agency were not convinced that a Planning Condition would cover the matter. All residential accommodation would be above this flood zone and would not be affected. The public realm area was confirmed at 10,000 sqm.

Councillor Davies asked if the business units on site would sustain themselves during out of term, quieter months. The Planning Officer stated that the site was adjacent to the and close to Mackintosh Village and the site would offer public realm space in the city by the river. The Planning Officer could not offer any guarantees but noted that the curation of the units would help determine their future.

Councillor S Ali moved the officer's recommendation. Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve subject to a S106 to secure affordable student housing and commercial waste disposal, removal of the EA's objection and agreement that the development meets the requirements of paragraph 171 (b) of the NPPF in relation to the exception test.

### **PH/24/26      138808/FO/2023 - Car Park at junction of Charles Street and York Street, Manchester - Deansgate Ward**

The Committee considered the report for the erection of 15-storeys building to provide purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA - Sui Generis)) along with site preparation works, works over the public highway and other associated works.

The Committee deferred consideration of this proposal on 14 March 2024 to allow them to visit the site.

An objector stated that concerns had been raised by local businesses, with DC Motors attending to object in March 2024. The objector (from Paintpots Nursery) spoke on behalf the lease holder group for Bracken House where there were 6 floors of studio flats. She noted that the Committee observed the site from the playground area but did not go in Bracken House and may not have checked the view from DC Motors. DC Motors will lose their street frontage and the outdoor play area at the Nursery will only be 3 metres away from the development and have a detrimental

effect on it. There was also the issue of the distance to the single aspect homes in Bracken House. This has been underassessed and half of all residents at these apartments with just one window will only have a wall to look at. By Manchester City Council standards, this is not good enough. Bracken House was converted into apartments prior to the “better space standards” scheme but it is residential and the report lacks a balanced view on this subject. Childcare and childcare staff sufficiency should be considered. This is another error in the report. The objector had experience in this area and hoped that the Committee could refuse this application on safety and ecological grounds as well as the safety of the nursery, wellbeing of local residents and economic effect on local businesses.

The applicant stated that 20% of the units would be affordable and there is a clear need for PBSA in Manchester. The scheme would release homes for family use. The applicant assured that there would be ongoing access to Paintpots Nursery and DC Motors with clear signage to the businesses and ramped access for pram users etc. The health of children and staff at the nursery has been properly assessed and no demolition is required, and therefore, no dust. This was not a complicated build and all noise aspects were controlled by a management plan, as reviewed by environmental officers. The gap between the building and nursery would be 6 metres, the same as it is on the opposite side of the development. Student “move-in” and “move-out” slots would be timed so as not to affect the nursery or other businesses. The site had been designed to fit in with the surroundings and the developers had offered Paintpots the use of some land as a playground space. The development responds to the demands for PBSA whilst sustaining local businesses and can be built safely.

The Planning Officer stated that this was a large report and all issues were covered within it, notably sun/daylight effects. Bracken House would experience a significant impact from the development. Although, the previous development of Bracken House had been undertaken by way of permitted development and this had an impact on this development site. Many of the factors involved in the current proposal were not unusual in a city centre context. Early Years colleagues had identified there may be some deficit of places and this may spread places around the wider area but they were not opposed to the proposal.

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

Councillor Kilpatrick stated that he was new to the Committee so missed the prior meeting in March. He expressed that it was important to note the impact of the development on the Early Years setting, stating that the loss of a care provider would be a loss to the area. Councillor Kilpatrick enquired on whether there was any mitigation to allow the operation of the nursery without any impact to it, if officers could be sure about this and additionally requested if there was any condition that could be added.

Councillor Davies had three concerns:

- The overhang of the building – would this come up to the edge of the playground and was it over the public area

- Access to DC Motors – would access be fully maintained and a telephone number be provided to the construction team. Would this business survive the creation and running of this development
- The role of Planning/Guidance – for an application that potentially poses a threat to local businesses and the potential damage done if children had to seek nursery places elsewhere. Now the city council was working more to European principles of having nurseries close to workplaces it was notably important to people

Councillor Davies noted that both businesses were unusual in a city centre setting but that there should be a drive to preserve this, rather than lose it.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there would be access to the nursery. A condition would require the applicant to explore the installation of a temporary access ramp but this could not be guaranteed. The overhang would be located on the opposite side of the building on York Street. Regarding DC Motors, there would be a contact number provided on hoardings around the site. The Planning Officer could not make any guarantees regarding existing businesses but mitigation is proposed. This is a development site and the applicant had addressed concerns as practically as possible.

Councillor Davies asked about whether York Street would be kept open.

Councillor L Bell stated that the viability of the nursery in a city centre setting was important. He asked if there were any specific vulnerabilities to this kind of business and to its future, additionally enquiring on whether there were conditions or policies to cover this.

The Planning Officer stated that the construction compound may yet be on a nearby site and the applicant had confirmed that they would not seek to close York Street or Charles Street and would be seeking a site nearby. Councillor L Bell's comments had been addressed in the report and considered by Manchester City Council officers. Nurseries were identified as vulnerable from the outset and there were specific measures for dust and noise. There would be a siren alarm if dust levels exceeded the baseline position, and all work would cease at that time. The use of screens was good practice and this was all within the planning conditions. Furthermore, there would be no work undertaken between 12noon and 14:30 so as to create no disturbance to the nursery.

Councillor S Ali moved the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Riasat seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve for the application, subject to a S106 to secure affordable student housing and commercial waste disposal.

**PH/24/27     138910/FO/2023 - Henesy House, 4 Nobby Stiles Drive,  
Manchester, M4 4FA - Miles Platting and Newton Heath Ward**

The Committee considered a proposal to provide accommodation for 19 single homeless men with communal living areas, staffroom and parking in an office building. Referrals would be made by the Council for low risk residents with low support needs. The Homeless Directorate support the proposal. Representations from Councillor Grimshaw and Hitchen have been received. There have been 15 objections and 4 letters of support.

The applicant stated that the applicant had managed homeless centres in Hulme and Collyhurst. This development would provide 19 rooms for homeless men and would take away the use of private BnB rooms and save money. There had been a public presentation to provide information and allay fears or concerns. The centre was for men classed as low risk and low needs. It would be staff with 24 hour CCTV and clients would be correctly matched to the level of need at the centre. Anti-social behaviour would not be tolerated. The building was previously a care home so any mobility issues were already addressed. The plan was for the centre to assist homeless men on their pathway to an independent life and finding work. The drive was to ensure that anyone in Manchester can have a secure home.

Local Ward Councillor Grimshaw stated that the application lacked supporting information. Local Councillors had met with Caritas and nothing was decided. The nearby school did not support the scheme. The report was poor in terms of presenting the objections clearly. Councillor Grimshaw shared his concerns, from being told the centre was for people being discharged from hospital to finding out that the scheme was offering a bed every night. Councillor Grimshaw felt that the Committee did not have enough information to make a decision and requested they conduct a site visit to understand the scheme and its proximity to a primary school.

Local Ward Councillor Hitchen was surprised to hear about how concerned the school was about this scheme. Councillor Hitchen had not been informed of the change of use for this building and the information from the Director of Homelessness Services had not been supportive. This was not simply a case of “not in my back yard” as there had been 550+ homeless people/families in this ward recorded in 2022. Last year there were 150 families and over 1000 in temporary accommodation. Information had been provided by officers that this site was ideal for 6 people and now this scheme proposed 3 times that amount. There were other recover centres for 59 males with addiction problems in Collyhurst already. The concern was for the use of this area as a stop-gap for individuals with complex issues and also for the safety of residents. It was not a case of not wanting to help but more that this area is already heavily addressing these kinds of issues already. Visitors to these males at the centre would not be allowed on site so this would force them onto the street. Councillor Hitchen stated that they had been told there would be no additional schemes of this sort in this area due to oversaturation and requested that the Committee conduct a site visit.

The Planning Officer stated that all comments on the proposal were included in the report and that there had been no response from the school to the scheme. Comments from the Homeless Directorate on page 247 showed support.

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

Councillor Hughes stated that, having read through all the information, a site visit was appropriate. He noted that the comments of support and objection were all condensed into a few lines. Councillor Hughes considered that this made it more difficult to be able to make a clear decision.

Councillor Davies stated that this was a scheme of much needed provision and, as such, she naturally supported it, so long as the location was suitable. Councillor Davies noted that there would be no overnight accommodation for staff and felt that this raised concerns around what would happen during a time of crisis. There was also a concern about comments in the report and the difference between these and the community feeling. More clarity was required and a site visit was appropriate due to the proximity to a nearby primary school.

Councillor Kilpatrick stated that this was the kind of application that was always welcomed and noted Policy H10 on page 248, which stated that the proposal would not result in a high concentration of similar uses in the area and would not place stress on existing infrastructure. However, Local Ward Councillors disagreed with this and therefore, Councillor Kilpatrick also supported a site visit.

The Director of Planning addressed the comment regarding drafting of comments in the reports, stating that they were normally shortened for brevity and there was nothing untoward in this practice and they had not been unreasonably shortened in this instance. It was then noted that the Committee would need to be clear about a reason for a site visit if this was their decision today and would have to be around establishing the context of the application in its environment.

Councillor Curley asked if all concerns could be address if a site visit was agreed, particularly the proximity to a primary school. The scheme would be run by a good provider, however each scheme should be determined on its own merits. If there were any gaps, it was requested that these be filled with the required information. Councillor Curley stated that he was in support of a site visit due to concerns over the proximity of the scheme to a primary school.

The Director of Planning requested clarity over the reasons for a site visit, stating that further clarity would be sought over any issues raised if the application was deferred today, adding that all information received by the Planning Team was within the pack.

Councillor Kilpatrick stated that there was concern over the concentration of other similar schemes in this area/ward and felt that this would be a reason for additional information.

Councillor Curley moved a proposal for the Committee to conduct a site visit. Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to defer consideration of the application, in order to undertake a site visit on the grounds of requiring further information on other similar schemes in the area and to check the proximity of the proposed scheme to a primary school.

**PH/24/28      138788/FO/2023 - Land at Mount Road, Manchester - Longsight Ward**

The Committee considered the erection of a youth, sports and community hub (Use Class E(d)(g)), F2(b)), 2 no. football pitches, combined netball and basketball court, cricket strip (Use Class F2 (c)), a three storey building comprising 36 no. apartments for young persons accommodation (Use Class C3) and 267 no. dwellinghouses (Use Class C3a), with associated landscaping, public realm, ecological mitigation, refuse storage, drainage, car parking and other associated works, with access from Wembley Road and Mount Road.

The scheme proposed new family homes for affordable rent and shared ownership (through a Registered Provider), together with purpose-designed independent living accommodation for young people aged 18 – 25. who are leaving the care system at 18 years old, are in work and are at risk of homelessness. In addition, the development would deliver a youth, sports and community hub with associated sports facilities which would have benefits for the local community.

The Planning Officer stated that this application, if it were agreed today, the applicant had agreed to meet the full cost of the off-site play provision at Debdale Park. This would be included in the legal agreement and the recommendation was Minded to Approve, subject to that legal agreement.

The agent for the applicant attended the hearing and addressed the Committee on the application, stating that this site was to be a youth sports and community hub, managed by Greater Manchester Youth Federation. Additionally, 36 individual living apartments for young people, owned and operated by CentrePoint. Lots of work and funding had been investing in youth services and session by GMYF and this site represented a unique opportunity with no viable future in its current state. A funding package was available for youth workers and would help meet needs of young people. Grass pitches would be created for football, basketball, netball and cricket strip plus two replacement pitches at Debdale Park. All accommodation would be for either affordable rent or shared ownership with 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom options. Support would be offered to young people via charity work and life skills. The construction of the proposal would create jobs and there would be 220 new trees added. A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and crossing were proposed as part of the package. 1 bicycle would be provided for every home plus EV charging. There would also be solar panels across the whole site. The agent closed by stating that no objections had been received and asked the Committee to grant the application today.

Local Ward Councillor Richards addressed the Committee and stated that some areas of the site in its current form had not been used for football/sports for up to a decade and regularly suffered from fly tipping. Councillor Richards had reached out to GMYF and spoke with other Ward Councillors about working on facilities at this

site. What has been achieved here had outstripped expectations. Time had been spent working with Melland School and others. This was a proud moment as there would be the first Centrepoint for independent care leavers studios with 32% at affordable rates for 1, 2, 3 and 4 bed properties. There were issues, in that the site was surrounded by schools. There were 2 specialist schools among these local schools so safety on Mount Road would need to be improved and the location of the crossing could be a problem. Councillor Richards wanted to put on record that she wanted traffic calming in the vicinity of this development if agreed with a crossing point. All the work on Debdale Park did not pose any problem but nobody should be put at risk by this scheme. Councillor Richards concluded by stating that there was real need for community provision and she offered her support to this development.

The Planning Officer noted that all comments had been covered by the agent and Councillor Richards.

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

Councillor Curley expressed that this was a good report and well needed for this area to invest in young people. Councillor Richards comments around traffic calming close to 2 specialist schools and 2 mainstream schools was noted as sensible and Councillor Curley agreed that the Committee would need to keep sight of this in their decision today.

The Planning Officer stated that there was a condition for off-site highway works, including traffic regulation orders and that the wording could be looked into which could be taken away and worked on with the Highways team.

Councillor Hughes supported the scheme as a great use for young people and congratulated the developers and Ward Councillor in their combined efforts. He noted that traffic lights would be needed at the junction.

Councillor Gartside spoke of how all Councillors would welcome similar schemes in their wards and asked if the Community Hub aspect was protected.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the Community Hub had full viability and would be delivered as part of the project.

Councillor S Ali moved the officer's recommendation. Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to be of Mind to Approve for the application, subject to section 106 agreement affordable housing, to enable the re-testing of the viability of the scheme should there be a delay in the implementation of the planning permission, together with a financial contribution to the development of pitches within Debdale Park, re-provision of sports pitches on the site.

**PH/24/29      137994/FO/2023 - Manchester Islamic High School for Girls, 55 High Lane, Manchester, M21 9FA - Chorlton Ward**



The Committee considered the erection of 12 no. 2.5 storey dwellinghouses; a pair of three storey semi-detached dwellinghouses; a three storey building comprising 6 no. apartments; the retention and change of use of the existing mansion house together with the erection of a two storey side extension to form 2 no. dwellinghouses; creation of vehicular access points, associated landscaping, car parking and boundary treatment following the demolition of the other existing buildings and structures.

The proposal relates to the erection of twelve two and half storey houses fronting Acres Road, a three storey building comprising six apartments fronting Stockton Road and the retention and change of use of the existing mansion house fronting High Lane, together with a two storey side extension to form two houses and the erection of a pair of semi-detached dwellings in the location of a former extension to the mansion house with the creation of vehicular access points, landscaping, car parking and boundary treatment.

The application site comprises a brownfield site measuring 0.4 hectares within Wilbraham Road /Edge Lane Conservation Area within Chorlton Ward.

The proposals were subject to the notification by way of 269 letters to nearby addresses, a site notice was posted at the site and an advertisement placed in the Manchester Evening News.

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

The agent for the applicant attended and addressed the Committee on the application. The agent thanked the planning team for their diligence. This scheme would improve the lives of current residents. The Islamic High School for Girls has already moved to another area and this site could now provide 22 new homes. The applicant had carried out consultations with residents and Ward Councillors at all times, having submitted the application in 2023. Residents' comments, along with those of the Highways Team, had shaped the project and the height of buildings and parking issues had been altered accordingly. The agent considered that the applicant had done everything practically possible to make this scheme acceptable. Demolition of the outbuildings would cause less than substantial harm. There would be three access roads into the site. The site had limited ecological foundations and this would actually be improved by this development. A high quality living environment would be created. There was no affordable housing available on this site owing to the lack of viability and the agent closed their statement by adding that this was a sustainable location and work would commence promptly if agreed by the Committee today.

Local Ward Councillor Benham addressed the Committee and stated that he and Councillor Hacking had been involved in the consultations on this development and welcomed these changes. There were traffic concerns, however and he wished to remain involved in how conditions were discharged, referring to Sections 10, 11, 12, 13 and 17 of the Conditions to be attached to the decision area of the report.

The Planning Officer stated that Acres Road would be widened as part of the development with a pavement put in place, plus on street parking all kept within

context of the surrounding area. Ward Councillors would be kept involved and updated.

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

Councillor Kilpatrick questioned what happened to the provision of affordable housing for this development and also enquired on whether EV charging was to be available for each household, noting that there were 6 parking spaces but 2 charging points.

The Planning Officer responded to say that the constrained conditions and land value did not allow for affordable housing after further financial matters were considered. This had been fully tested. Usually, there was a ratio of 20% EV charging per amount of dwellingspaces but the Planning Officer confirmed that the planning team would work with the developer to increase this.

Councillor Curley moved the officer's recommendation. Councillor Riasat seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve subject to comments regarding EV charging and the signing of a Section 106 agreement to require re-testing of viability.

#### **PH/24/30     139648/FO/2024 - Land Adjacent to 32 Clevedon Street, Manchester, M9 5PL - Harpurhey Ward**

The Committee considered the erection of 7 no. residential dwellings (Use Class C3) and associated hard landscaping and infrastructure works.

The proposed application relates to the erection of 7 x two storey, terraced dwellinghouses. Following notification of the application, 8 representations have been received, including 7 objections and 1 neutral response.

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

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

Councillor S Ali moved the officer's recommendation. Councillor Curley seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee resolved to Approve the application.

#### **PH/24/31     Confirmation of The Manchester City Council (Land at Ashfell Court, Chorlton) - Tree Preservation Order 2023 - Chorlton Ward**

The Committee considered a Tree Preservation Order request at Ashfell Court, 35 Edge Lane, Chorlton cum Hardy, M21 9HE, under Section 199 of the Town and Country

Planning Act 1990, and that the Order should cover the tree plotted as T1 on the plan attached to the report.

The committee was asked to consider 4 objections and 2 letters of support made to this order. This related to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) served on a Willow tree within the side/rear garden area of Ashfell Court, 35 Edge Lane, Chorlton cum Hardy, M21 9HE.

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

A local resident, in support of this TPO request, attended and addressed the Committee with his representations, stating that he had been the Chair of Ashfell Court for 30 years and had lived there for 34 years. The Court was comprised of small private flats with extensive gardens, trees, flowers and lawns. 15 trees already had TPOs on the site and he, along with another resident of Ashfell Court had applied for this TPO also. The supporter requested that this tree was given permanent status. All trees are assessed every 2 to 3 years with 25% of the trees being pruned last year. This was a 50 year old tree that was a host to lots of birdlife.

The Planning Officer did not add anything to the supporter's comments.

Councillor Lovecy move the Director of Planning's recommendation. Councillor Curley seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee resolved to instruct the City Solicitor to confirm the Tree Preservation at Ashfell Court, 35 Edge Lane, Chorlton cum Hardy, M21 9HE, under Section 199 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and that the Order should cover the tree plotted as T1 on the plan attached to this report.