

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 12 March 2020**

**Present:** Councillor Curley (Chair)

**Councillors:** Nasrin Ali, Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Hitchen, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Madeleine Monaghan, Riasat, Watson and White

**Apologies:** Councillors Shaukat Ali and Flanagan

**Also in attendance:** Councillors Igbon, Kilpatrick, Leech and Wright

#### **PH/20/23      Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications, since the agenda was issued, was circulated.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/20/24 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 13 February 2020 as a correct record.

#### **PH/20/25      125799/FO/2019 – John Dalton West/John Dalton Tower Chester Street M1 4GD – Deansgate Ward**

The application related to the demolition of the existing John Dalton West Building and associated structures, and erection of a new 7 storey education building for the Faculty of Science and Engineering, physical connections to and external refurbishment of the John Dalton Tower, hard and soft landscaping works, car and cycle parking and associated works.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to a comment from a local resident which had been forwarded by Councillor Johns who supported this resident's comments. The resident supported the scheme but requested that there should be no construction traffic on the street and requested that the developer support foot and cycle access around the Mancunian Way. The Planning Officer then confirmed that a pedestrian crossing had been included as part of the plans and would be positioned on Cambridge Street, also confirming that the developer will have a construction management plan with regard to construction vehicles.

The applicant then addressed the Committee and explained that the new building was for Manchester University stating that staff and students were constrained on the current site and there was an overall need for modernising the facilities. The new build would support the science faculties and, if approved, would attract staff and students on an international level whilst also strengthening local partnerships, such as with NHS Manchester. Furthermore, the facilities would promote forms of sustainable travel in reducing parking spaces for personal use.

Councillor Davies, who represents Deansgate Ward, welcomed the application stating that MMU was an important component in Manchester's approach to developing strategies to counter future health issues. However, Councillor Davies raised a concern about the consultation area and felt that some residents adjacent to the proposed development had already been impacted by other recent developments. Councillor Davies requested that MMU maintain a dialogue with local residents and do their utmost to have a minimal impact on those living nearby.

Councillor Andrews proposed to move the application and the Committee gave this their unanimous support.

### **Decision**

To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted and the Late Representations submitted.

### **PH/20/26 123983/FO/2019 – 1 Salmon Street Manchester M4 1AA - Piccadilly Ward**

The application related to the renovation of the vacant building at 1 Salmon Street, near Shudehill in Manchester's Northern Quarter. The application was requesting a mixed use Café and Drinking Establishments, serving only cold food. The ground floor and upper levels would operate as two separate business but would be operated and managed by the applicant.

The Planning Officer had nothing further to add since providing the Late Representations on the application.

The applicant stated they did not wish to comment either but would be happy to answer any questions.

Councillor Lyons questioned whether waste from the premises would be stored on site before being put out for collection. The Planning Officer confirmed that there was an internal waste store as part of the report.

Councillor Lyons then proposed to move the application and the Committee gave this their unanimous support.

### **Decision**

To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted and the Late Representations submitted.

**PH/20/27 124302/FO/2019 Land bounded by Chester Road, Hulme Hall Road & Ellesmere Street M15 4JY - Hulme Ward**

Consideration of this application was deferred at the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on 13 February 2020 to enable a site visit to take place.

The application was for the demolition of the existing building on site and the erection of a residential-led mixed use development within two build blocks ranging from eight to eighteen storeys in height. The development consists of three hundred and sixty-six residential units, two hundred and seventeen square metres of commercial floor space, associated car and cycle parking within a basement level, public realm and landscaping, access and servicing arrangements and other associated works.

The site is located on the north east side of the junction of Chester Road and Hulme Hall Road, and is within the St Georges area of Hulme. It is bounded by Hulme Hall Road, Chester Road and Ellesmere Street.

The Planning Officer had nothing further to add since providing the application report.

A local resident spoke at the meeting as chair of a local community forum to object to the application on the grounds that there had not been any consultation with the forum. She spoke of concerns around a “gated community” feel to the development which would exclude current residents and also explained concerns around the increased population in the area relating to the three hundred and sixty six new dwellings proposed in the application and the strain it would put on traffic and local amenities. The local resident spoke of concerns about the height of the proposed dwellings and questioned why Hulme Ward was being considered for such high rise buildings of eighteen storeys.

The applicant then addressed the Committee stating that the development was on a brownfield site and that the design and materials were sympathetic to the rest of the immediate area. The applicant confirmed the amount of dwellings as three hundred and sixty six apartments comprising of one, two and three bedroomed options and stated that the development would enhance the Castlefield area. There would be a communal space, tree lined areas, roof gardens and appropriate lighting. The applicant added that, overall, this development would provide high quality accommodation. The applicant stated further that the development would provide construction jobs, supply the City Council with £600,000 per annum in Council Tax and was meeting concerns around Climate Change in providing generous cycle parking and electric car charging on site.

Councillor Igbon and Councillor Wright, both representing Hulme Ward, spoke of concerns about the application. Councillor Igbon stated that she had worked with the applicant and local residents and felt that there were serious concerns in treating the St George’s area as though it was the City Centre and allowing developments under City Centre regulations to be considered. Councillor Igbon stated that she could not support the application, making comment that it was at odds with the City Councils own Climate Emergency Policy with regard to the increased traffic the application

would bring about if approved. This development, she stated, would not help or house any of the current local residents in the Hulme Ward. Councillor Wright made comment that there was talk of the St George's area being treated as the City Centre and part of Castlefield and refuted these claims, confirming the area is within Hulme Ward. Councillor Wright continued to say that there was a large wall that appeared to keep current residents out, that daylight rules for the development were as applied for with a City Centre development and therefore not in keeping with the area. Councillor Wright confirmed that she was not opposed to the development of this site but was against this particular application, mentioning the City Council's own Climate Emergency Policy with regard to the likelihood of increased traffic attached to three hundred and sixty six dwellings.

The Planning Officer confirmed that Hulme Ward as a whole did not sit within an area for City Centre rules regarding planning applications but, that this specific area of Hulme did and, as such, the proposals complied with the relevant policies.

Councillor Hitchen raised her concerns regarding the density of population on the site and stated that she would not support the application.

Councillor Lovecy had concerns about the proposal, stating that the plans seemed to present an "inward looking" development that did not represent integration with current residents. Further concern was raised by Councillor Lovecy as to the provision of local amenities to support the increased population, such as Doctors and Dentists. The Planning Officer addressed this latter concern stating that the ground floor commercial premises made provision for health centres.

Councillor White confirmed he felt unable to support the project too, adding that there was a lack of affordable housing within the application and also nothing presented as adding to the nearby St George's park.

Councillor Lyons felt that the area itself did need re-developing but stated that this application was for too large a development for him to support.

The Planning Officer stated that the profit for the developer was marginal and therefore, a contribution to the park was not possible. The Planning Officer confirmed to the Committee that the development was not a gated community and included a street that ran through the site.

Councillor Davies had concerns around the consultation, initial proposal for the number of residents which appeared to have doubled and could not think of a comparable development in the City Centre. The Head of Planning confirmed to the Committee that the concern raised about consultation was not in relation to that carried out by the Planning Service; comments raised about pre application consultation was not relevant to the decision making process and assured the Committee that the development as a whole had been assessed against the relevant policies.

At this point, Councillor Lovecy stated that she was minded to refuse due to overdevelopment and Councillor Andrews supported this motion.

Voting for the application was split at 6 for and 6 against with The Chair of the committee, Councillor Curley, using a casting vote to make a majority of the Minded to Refuse vote.

## **Decision**

Minded to refuse due to the negative impact of the proposed development on the character of the area by virtue of the height of the development proposal and the proposed increase in population to the immediate surroundings, creating the likelihood of increased traffic, which is counter-intuitive to the Climate Emergency Policy, and strain on local amenities if allowed.

The application was deferred and the Director of Planning asked to bring a report back which addresses the concerns raised and whether there are reasons for refusal that could be sustained.

### **PH/20/28      125186/FO/2019 - Riverside Lodge, 208 Palatine Road, Manchester, M20 2WF – Didsbury West Ward**

This application was reported to the Committee on 13 February 2020. As Members resolved that they were minded to refuse the proposal, the application was deferred with the Committee requesting that a report be brought back which addresses these concerns and provide further consideration of potential reasons for refusal.

Reasons for refusal were now included and outlined as “impact on residential amenity, due to construction work and in particular noise and disturbance and the loss of use of the lift for a period of time. Loss of part of the green area fronting Palatine Road.”

Riverside Lodge is residential complex on Palatine Road consisting of 34 flats split into two blocks. Block A is 4 storeys in height (flat nos. 1 to 16), while block B is a part 4/part 5 storey building housing flat nos. 17-34. The ground floor levels of both buildings are elevated as they sit on top of undercroft parking facilities for 34 cars. To the front of the blocks is a hard surfaced area used for servicing and parking, while at the rear there is a communal lawned area. To the west of the site is a wooded area and beyond that stands the Green Belt. To the east of the site, on the opposite side of Palatine Road, stands a modern residential development set behind a Site of Biological Interest. To the north of Block B is another strip of woodland, beyond which stands three detached dwellinghouses. Riverside Court, a 3 storey residential complex of 24 flats lies to the south of Block A. The row of trees along the rear boundary of the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order and the site is located within Flood Zone 3.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that issues had been addressed since the previous minded to refuse decision.

A local resident, objecting to the application, spoke of the flood risk, loss of grassy area to support a proposed car park but expressed her highest concern at the temporary loss of the use of the lift within the building and disabled parking bays if the development were to be agreed.

Councillors Kilpatrick and Leech, representing Didsbury West Ward, were present to address the Committee with their objections. Councillor Kilpatrick spoke of his concern with regard to the current residents and that those with mobility issues would be the most affected by the loss of use of the lift and parking areas. Councillor Leech thanked the Committee for their decision of minded to refuse in February 2020 and highlighted the loss of a fire escape and loss of parking, more than likely leading people to park illegally on the main road, both leading to safety risks. Councillor Leech made further comment that a condition which allowed the building to be erected in the past would have to be broken in order to carry out this development and questioned the initial decision which allowed the development of these residential premises in 2014.

The Planning Officer made comment with regard to the flood risk that the Council's Flood Risk Management Team and Environment Agency were satisfied with regard to the development and stated that a minded to refuse decision could not be based on temporary measures.

The Director of Planning confirmed to the Committee of the process for bringing back the original report with a supplementary report which addresses concerns; a potential reason for refuse decision.

Councillor Andrews then gave his minded to refuse decision based proposed car parking, as set out in the report at page 132. Councillor White seconded this vote.

The Committee voted eleven to Refuse the application with one abstention.

## **Decision**

To refuse the application on the grounds that the proposed car park forms a visually intrusive feature and will result in the loss of part of an existing landscaped strip to the detriment of visual amenity and landscaped character of this part of Palatine Road, contrary to Policy DM1 in the Manchester Core Strategy.

### **PH/20/29      121828/FO/2018 – 351 Palatine Road Northenden M22 4FY – Northenden Ward**

The site consists of a terrace of commercial properties, namely 349 to 359 Palatine Road, located with the Northenden District Centre. The properties are currently vacant but were last used as a beauty salon, a café and a bar on the ground floor, with associated commercial space above. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing terrace and replace it with the following:

Erection of a 4 storey building consisting of a ground floor commercial unit (226m<sup>2</sup>), with 16 two bed apartments above. Creation of 15 parking spaces at the rear of the site, access to which would be via the existing access road at the side of the property. Two of these spaces would be disabled parking spaces. Erection of an external bin and cycle store.

The Planning Officer stated that he had nothing further to add to the report.

The applicant stated that he had nothing to add either but was available to answer any questions. Councillor Madeline Monaghan stated that she welcomed this application for Northenden Ward.

Councillor Andrews proposed to move the application and the Committee gave this their unanimous support.

### **Decision**

To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted and the Late Representations submitted.