

# Public Document Pack

## Planning and Highways Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 20 September 2018

**Present:** Councillor Ellison (Chair)

**Councillors:** Shaukat Ali, Clay, Curley, Dar, Kamal, Kirkpatrick, J Lovecy, Watson, White and J Wilson

**Apologies:** Councillor Nasrin Ali, J C Lyons, Madeleine Monaghan and Strong

**Also present:** Councillors: Akbar, Ahmed Ali, A Simcock, Wheeler and Wright

#### **PH/18/74. Interests**

Councillor White declared a prejudicial interest in Item 14 - The Old House At Home, 73 Burton Road, Manchester, M20 1HB

Councillor Watson declared a prejudicial interest in Item 15 - 118 Egerton Road North, Manchester, M16 0DA

Councillor Wilson declared a prejudicial interest in Item 16 - 825 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M20 2SN

#### **PH/18/75. Minutes**

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 23 August 2018.

#### **PH/18/76. 118538/OO/2017 - North Manchester Business Park, Land Off Brightside Road, Manchester**

Planning application 118538/OO/2017 for development comprising: Erection of a commercial vehicle MOT and maintenance facility and provision of associated vehicle storage area with all matters to be considered, together with an outline application with all matters reserved except for means of access for up to 8,537m<sup>2</sup> of employment uses (B1/B2/B8) was received.

The development will comprise a predominantly single storey building with some office elements and storage at first floor level for the servicing, maintenance and VOSA testing of the Salford Van Hire fleet. In addition it is proposed that there will be a manned gatehouse to control access to the site, a canopied fuelling area and screened washing area, staff and visitor parking areas and a large area dedicated to vehicle storage.

Neither the applicant nor any objectors attended the meeting, and the Committee carefully considered all of the information contained in the report. The Committee concluded that that the proposed use will not result in significant impact upon either residential or visual amenity, or upon the operation of the local highway network.

Policy states that north Manchester is expected to provide approximately 14ha of employment land and identifies North Manchester Business Park as key development opportunity for employment purposes. The proposed development will help facilitate the long-term redevelopment of a former industrial, brownfield site and result in economic and environmental benefits to the area.

The site is situated in a highly sustainable location and will harness the economic objectives of both the City Council and the Government by bringing forward an effective use of land that will ultimately create jobs and contribute to the local economy.

Any potential harm is significantly outweighed by the efficient use of land that will result in environmental improvements to the immediate area and also the creation of additional employment both during construction and during the operational life of the development. It is estimated that the development has the potential to support 300 full time jobs once complete.

## **Decision**

MINDED TO APPROVE subject to a legal agreement which requires that the vehicle maintenance and storage facility is completed in full within 2 years from the date of planning permission; to submit all reserved matter applications relating to the outline proposal within 2 years from the date of permission; and for the development to be completed in full within a further 2 years from the date of the last of the reserved matters.

### **PH/18/77. 120707/FO/2018 - 20 Brideoak Street, Manchester, M8 0PN**

Planning application 120707/FO/2018 for the erection of single storey extension to the side and rear of the premises to form ancillary accommodation was received.

The application site relates to a single storey building used as a community centre (D1 use). The site is bounded by a wall of approximately 2 metres, along the periphery of the curtilage. The site also contains an area of hardstanding to the east of the building, which provides a number of off-street parking spaces.

The land is adjoined by residential properties on Brideoak Street to the south and west (C3 use), a place of worship (D1 use) to the east and garage (B2 use) on Cheetham Hill Road to the north. The building lies close to the junction between Brideoak street and Cheetham Hill Road, a major arterial route connecting the wider Cheetham area to the City centre. The location is nearby to the district centre of the Cheetham area with its wide range of commercial uses.

The submitted application seeks full planning permission for the erection of single storey extensions to the side and rear of the premises to form ancillary accommodation. The proposed extension would create 93 square metres of additional floor space within the community centre. The extension would lead to the creation of a mother and baby room, storage area, a larger kitchen area, larger male and female toilets and a quiet/study room.

Planning permission was granted on 16 July 1987 under planning reference 029257 for the conversion of a derelict church hall into a community centre.

The applicant spoke to the Committee in support of the application, and said that they acknowledged the concerns raised by the objectors, but that after discussions with officers, measures had been put in place to address all of the concerns raised.

Officers confirmed that there will be an amendment to Condition 10 regarding the Travel Plan, requiring the use of Traffic Marshalls and a further Condition requiring the windows at the rear of the premises to be obscurely glazed.

## **Decision**

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report, the amended condition regarding the Travel Plan and an additional condition requiring the windows at the rear of the premises to be obscurely glazed.

### **PH/18/78. 117249/FO/2017 - 231 Upper Brook Street, Manchester, M13 0HL**

This application was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

### **PH/18/79. 120507/FO/2018 - 30 Albert Road, Manchester, M19 2FP**

Planning application 120507/FO/2018 for the change of use of former post office and sorting office to a mixed use licensed food hall, grocery shop and deli, microbrewery, community space and associated offices with installation of photo voltaic panels to flat roofs and elevational alterations to rear outbuildings was received.

This application relates to a former retail post office and associated postal sorting depot constructed in the 1920's. The applicant has indicated that the former retail post office was used as a restaurant for 8 years. This use was undertaken without planning permission and has recently ceased. The sorting depot was vacated by Royal Mail in April 2017 and was subsequently acquired by the applicant along with the former retail post office. The proposal therefore seeks the comprehensive development of the entire site.

A local resident spoke in relation to the proposals, but said that they did support the proposals in principle, but had concerns about the level of vehicle access at the site. He suggested that there should be changes to the entrance and exit arrangements to minimise the risk of traffic congestion or risk to the public from increased vehicle movements.

The applicant's agent also spoke to the Committee and said that the proposals would revitalise a currently unused building, and would add value to the local area. She said that Levenshulme had changed over the past few years, and that venues of this nature would add amenity to the Community, rather than detract from it. She also acknowledged the concerns of residents regarding traffic management, but said that these issues had been fully addressed and would be managed under the terms of the agreed conditions.

Officers reminded the Committee that the premises was a former Royal Mail Sorting Office, and that the level of vehicle movements proposed under the current scheme would be much less intensive than under the former use.

The Committee did welcome the proposals, as well as the employment opportunities and social value that would be created, but expressed concern that the site had been used as a restaurant without the appropriate planning permission for a period of 8 years without enforcement. However, the Committee concluded that the introduction of the proposed uses outside Levenshulme District Centre was justified given its close proximity to the established high street and potential for the development to positively contribute to the vitality of the retail offer and local regeneration. Any impact on residential amenity would be capable of being satisfactorily managed the proposed schedule of conditions.

## **Decision**

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representations.

### **PH/18/80. 120378/FO/2018 - Gorton Mount Primary Academy, Mount Road, Manchester, M18 7GR**

Planning application 120378/FO/2018 for the erection of a two-storey primary school with associated playgrounds, all-weather pitch, landscaping, car parking and new vehicular access onto Mount Road following the demolition of the existing building, with retention of existing temporary classroom during construction works was received.

The site is currently occupied by the former Gorton Mount Primary School. This school relocated to a new school building on Shillingford Road to the east of Mount Road (ref: 106655/FO/2014/N2) which was approved in November 2014. Since that time the building has been occupied by a pupil referral unit, which is due to relocate to premises adjacent to Plymouth Grove primary school, at the junction of Plymouth Grove and Plymouth Grove West shortly.

The proposed development comprises a primary school which has been designed to accommodate 420 pupils, and 52 nursery places, being taught by 21 teachers, 20 teaching assistants, 5 Special Educational Needs staff, and the head and deputy head teachers, with 3 office staff.

There were no objectors present, but the Committee carefully considered all of the representations contained in the report.

The applicant was present but did not wish to address the Committee and relied on the information contained in the report.

The Committee noted that this would be much needed provision, and welcomed the fact that it would utilise a previous school site. They acknowledged the concerns raised about poor parking and congestion and requested clarification as to how this

could be effectively managed. The Committee also asked for clarification as to whether the provision for staff parking was adequate.

Officers confirmed that the existing school could operate without any further control measures in place, and said that the current proposals would include 23 additional car parking spaces. Officers also told the Committee that there was a comprehensive travel plan and package of measures to ensure that any loss of amenity due to traffic would be mitigated as far as possible.

Officer also confirmed that the BREEAM rating would be acceptable, and that there would be a comprehensive contaminated land condition attached to any approval.

The Committee also requested that officers explore the possibility of the applicant undertaking educational work with future pupils given the historic nature of the site and the surrounding area. Officers confirmed that they would be happy to propose such educational work to the applicant.

The Committee concluded that this proposal offers the opportunity to provide new primary school in response to an identified need, which is an essential facility to serve the local community. All other issues have been addressed in the report and subject to conditions the recommendation is to approve in line with the relevant policies.

## **Decision**

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representations.

### **PH/18/81. 120113/FO/2018 - 1 Alpha Place Manchester M15 4PP**

Planning application 120113/FO/2018 for the erection of a seven storey apart-hotel (use class C1), comprising 59 rooms on the upper floors, with reception area and ancillary residents' lounge and breakfast area on the ground floor was received.

The site measures 0.05 hectares and is within Knott Mill. It is bounded by Alpha Place, Jordan Street, Commercial Street and buildings that front onto Commercial Street and Constance Street. Opposite the site, fronting Jordan Street and Commercial Street, is the 10 storey Hill Quays residential development. To the north is a four storey brick building with a pitched slate roof, which is occupied by offices, with residential use on the top floor and within the roofspace. The buildings to the west are offices. The area contains a mixture of uses, including residential, offices and design studios and has a diversity of architectural styles.

The proposal is for a seven storey apart-hotel with a ground floor reception area, including a residents' lounge and breakfast area. A cycle store, with nine cycle spaces, and bin storage would be accommodated within the ground floor. The bin store would have four 1100l bins and two 240l bins, segregated to provide for general refuse, pulpable recycling, mixed recycling, garden waste and food waste. The bin store would have access doors onto Jordan Street and staff would be responsible for

taking the bins to and from the collection point on Jordan Street. The building would have a basement to accommodate back-of-house facilities.

The applicant spoke to the Committee and said that the proposals would regenerate a currently derelict site, and would provide high quality accommodation with outstanding design quality. The aparthotel would be run and managed by an experienced operator, who would ensure minimal disruption and disamenity to existing residents. He pointed out that previous similar approval had established the principle that the site was suitable for an aparthotel.

The Committee asked why there was no car parking available, and queried why there was no mention of any off site provision, bearing in mind the prevalence of car use. Officers confirmed that there were several thousand car parking spaces available in the immediate vicinity, and that the site enjoyed excellent public transport links for train, tram and bus travel. Officers also reminded the Committee that the assessment of the proposals by Highways Officers included the opinion that the site was in “an optimum location for sustainable transport”, which accorded with both National and Local Policy. Officers added that the size of the site was so limited that it would not be realistic to expect on-site car parking to be provided.

The Committee also asked about the management of guests at the aparthotel, and how the operators would ensure that no disturbance would be caused to surrounding residents. Officers confirmed that the premises would be acoustically insulated to a high standard to prevent noise breakout and disturbance, but conceded that the behaviour of patrons while on the street could be hard to control. However, the responsibility for controlling people on the street was considered to be outside the responsibilities of the proposed operators. The application terms and conditions will ensure that what the operator can control will be properly controlled.

Officers also confirmed that there is adequate facilities for disabled people in and around the proposed premises. The Committee concluded that the proposal was in accordance with the City of Manchester’s planning policies and regeneration priorities including the Adopted Core Strategy, the relevant Strategic Regeneration Frameworks and the Community Strategy, as well as the national planning policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework, and should be approved.

## **Decision**

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representation.

### **PH/18/82. 120149/FO/2018 - Car Park Between 57 And 59 Ducie Street, Manchester, M1 2JQ**

Planning application 120149/FO/2018 for the Erection of 7 to 8 storey residential building (Class C3) to provide 41 apartments ( 7 x 1-bedroom 1-person apartments, 6 x 1-bedroom 2-person apartments, 6 x 2-bedroom 3-person apartments, 22 x 2-bedroom 4-person apartments) with associated landscaping and other works was received.

The applicant's agent spoke in support of the proposals and said that this would be a very high quality development in a sustainable location in the City Centre. The property would be managed by a reputable and experienced management company on a day to day basis, in the first phase of a new City district in this part of the City Centre. She said that the site currently has a negative impact on the street scene, which could be rectified by this development. There would also be a financial contribution towards the provision of affordable housing in alternative locations.

Councillor Wheeler spoke in objection to the proposals, and said that it was unacceptable that the contribution to affordable housing would be less than the 20% target that was as per the Council's Policy. He also said that there was no indication where the affordable housing would be located, and that he was disappointed that the viability assessment had not been shared more widely. In addition, Councillor Wheeler objected to the fact that the proposed accommodation would not be suitable for longer term family residence.

Officers confirmed that the legal position regarding the sharing of viability assessments was in a transition period. The consultation period regarding the proposed assessment checklist had been virtually concluded, and that the checklist would be introduced imminently. The Head of Planning, Building Control and Licencing confirmed that they are committed to providing greater transparency, but that this had to be done within a legal framework.

Officers also confirmed that the target of 20% affordable housing was constantly monitored, and was an overall target encompassing all developments but not individual developments. In addition, officers confirmed that no new social housing has been built in the City Centre for over 2 years.

The Committee asked whether the waste disposal arrangements were adequate, and officers confirmed that total number of bins in the development has been calculated from City Council document 'GD04 Waste Storage and Collection Guidance for New Developments V2.00 -0 Citywide Support - Environmental Protection (September 2014). Officers confirmed that they would add to the Waste Management condition terms that each apartment would be supplied with separate containers to enable and encourage a greater degree of recycling.

## **Decision**

To be Minded to Approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the later representation and subject to the signing of a S106 agreement for a financial contribution towards the provision of off-site affordable housing.

### **PH/18/83. 118045/FO/2017 - Land Bounded By Worsley Street, Arundel Street, Ellesmere Street And Egerton Street, Manchester, M15 4JZ**

Planning application 118045/FO/2017 for the erection of a 10 storey residential building (Use Class C3a) together ground floor commercial units (Use Classes A1, A2, B1, D1 and D2) (379 sqm) and the erection of 35 storey residential building (Use Class C3a), following demolition of existing buildings, together with the change of use of the former Department of Transport Building to form a mixed use residential and

commercial building (Use Classes C3a, A1, A2, B1, D1 and D2), forming 386 residential apartments in total with associated amenity space, car and cycle parking, access, landscaping and other associated works was received.

The site measures 0.5 hectares and is bounded by Arundel Street, Ellesmere Street, Worsley Street and the inner ring Road. It includes the 4 storey DOT building fronting Ellesmere Street and a single storey gym and fire place on Arundel Street. It is divided into two distinct plots by Balmforth Street, an un-adopted highway. An area of green space at the top of Balmforth Street contains trees and the land rises, providing a buffer to the IRR. The site is within the St Georges area but it has also has a prominent position on the IRR. .

The surrounding area is largely residential with some ancillary commercial and leisure uses. The 6 storey Box Works apartment building is to the north with the 7 storey Moho and 8 storey Base building to the west fronting Ellesmere Street and Arundel Street. Buildings within St George's island on the opposite side of the Bridgewater Canal are between 9 and 15 storeys in height. St George's Church, a grade II\* listed building to the south has been converted into apartments. The church is surrounded by a substantial former graveyard area and its gates and gate post are grade II listed.

The site is within the Castlefield Conservation Area and the following listed buildings are nearby: Church of St George (Grade II\*); Churchyard walls, gate, piers and gates at Church of St George (Grade II); Former Canal Flour Mills (Grade II); Hulme Lock Branch Canal (Grade II); Castlefield railway Viaduct Manchester Central to Dawson Street (Grade II); Rochdale Canal lock number 92 and Castle Street Bridge (Grade II); Merchants warehouse (Grade II); Middle Warehouse at former Castlefield goods yard (Grade II); Bridgewater canal offices (Grade II); [215-219 Chester Road](#) (Grade II); Former Campfield Market Hall (Grade II); Former LNWR goods transfer shed (Grade II); and Former Liverpool Road station goods warehouse (Grade II).

The development proposes the construction of two residential buildings of 35 and 10 storeys and the conversion of the former DOT building to provide 386 apartments and 379 sqm of commercial floor space.

A representative of the Britannia Basin Community Forum spoke in objection to the proposals, and said that the proposals would be an overdevelopment of the site. In addition, although this was classified as a City Centre development, she pointed out that the site was in a residential area of Hulme. She said that the applicant had not addressed all of the concerns, and was especially concerned that only 3 of the proposed apartments would have 3 bedrooms which was not in keeping with Council policy to encourage families to live in or close to the City Centre.

The Committee were also told that the proposed commercial units could easily be converted to office use rather than retail or other commercial use, which would provide no value at all to local residents. The street scene would be taken up by more than 2/3's by bin stores, with less than 1/3 being retail or commercial units.

She added that the proposals would be overbearing and bulky, given that the majority of the surrounding buildings were no more than 8 storeys high. She told the Committee that there was no evidence as to why underground parking could not be provided, given that many of the surrounding buildings did have underground parking provision. In addition, she raised concerns that the access to the site would be from the Mancunian Way, which was already heavily congested at all times.

The applicant's agent spoke in support of the proposals, and said that the proposal would have a positive impact on the regeneration of this part of the City Centre including contributing to the supply of high quality housing. Active frontages together with high quality façade will make a positive contribution to the city scape.

The current condition of the application site has at best a neutral impact on the area in terms of wider townscape quality. There is the clearly capacity for change which could enhance the setting of adjacent heritage assets and wider townscape. The retention of the DOT building is also considered to be a welcomed addition as part of the proposals and the conservation area.

Councillor Wright spoke in objection to the proposed development, and said that she fully supported the objections of the residents. In addition, she said that the development would have a significantly negative impact on the Castlefield Conservation Area, as well as the setting of St Georges Church. She said that there has been a tendency to build bigger and bigger buildings over a period of time, that do not provide the family housing of community infrastructure that is needed in the Ward. She added that there are some positive aspects to the scheme, but that the positive aspects do not outweigh the negative impact that this development would have on the existing residents.

The nature of the accommodation provided would not encourage people to live and stay in the area, and in anticipation of a high level of transience she had concerns that this would not be a cohesive development for the wider community. In addition, she said that it was not acceptable that there would be no affordable or social housing provision.

Officers said that most of the issues raised were addressed in the report, the report had outlined that the proposal would not have any unduly harmful impacts on the setting of any heritage assets and in most instances will have a positive impact on the Manchester skyline. They added that the parts of the development that were closest to people's homes were fully in keeping with the scale of development in the immediate vicinity. The scale of the building to the Mancunian Way elevation would enhance a key entrance to the City and would be of benefit to the wider Cityscape as a whole.

The Committee expressed concern that a development of this scale and size would have a negative impact on the setting of the Castlefield Conservation area and the setting of the nearby listed buildings. They also expressed concerns regarding the impact on the existing residents of Britannia Basin, and concluded that the value of this scheme would not outweigh the negative impacts.

## **Decision**

Minded to refuse the application and request officers bring a report back which addresses the concerns raised by the Committee and to provide potential reasons for refusal for further consideration.

**PH/18/84. 120908/FO/2018 - Langdale Hall, Upper Park Road, Manchester, M14 5RJ**

Planning application 120908/FO/2018 for the erection of 6no. three storey six bedroom townhouses to provide managed student accommodation (sui generis) with landscaping, cycle parking and other associated uses was received.

In November 2005 planning permission was granted (ref. 073960/FO/2004/N2) for the conversion of Langdale Hall into 15 flats and for the erection of a three storey building to form 31 flats to the north of the villa.

In November 2006 planning permission was refused (ref. 080389/FO/2006/N2) for the erection of a three storey building to form 18 flats on this site. The subsequent appeal (ref. APP/B4215/A/07/2034511) was dismissed in May 2007.

The applicants submitted an identical application (117078/FO/2017) in July 2017 to the one now proposed. It was placed before the Planning and Highways Committee on 19 October 2017 with a recommendation of approve. At that meeting the Committee resolved to defer further deliberation until they had undertaken a site visit. The application was then further considered by the Planning and Highways Committee on 16<sup>th</sup> November 2017 following a site visit that morning. As Members resolved that they were minded to refuse the proposal, the application was deferred again and it was requested that a report be brought back which addressed the Committee's concerns and provided for further consideration potential reasons for refusal. The application was then placed before the Planning and Highways Committee on 14<sup>th</sup> December 2017 and was duly refused for the following reason:

*1) The proposed development, due to its siting would be harmful to the spacious character and landscaped setting of the site and as a result would have a detrimental impact upon the character of the Victoria Park Conservation Area and the setting of Langdale Hall, contrary to Policies DM1 and EN3 in the Core Strategy and saved UDP Policies DC18 and DC19.*

In March 2018 the applicants obtained planning permission (119003/FO/2018) to convert a number of basement rooms into 1 no. studio flat and 1 no. one-bedroom flat for student accommodation.

A local resident spoke in objection to the proposals and said that this identical application to one previously refused attracted the same reasons for objection.

The applicant's agent spoke to the Committee and said that the use of the site as student accommodation had been firmly established, and that the accommodation would be marketed at older students who wanted a quiet setting. They had fully considered the heritage of the site, and the proposals were sensitive to the setting of the Conservation area.

Councillor Ahmed Ali spoke in support of the residents objections, and said that the proposals were completely unsuitable for the conservation area, and supported the resident's assertion that the reasons for refusal remained unchanged.

Officers confirmed that in this case, after assessment the benefits of redeveloping the site would outweigh any harm to the Conservation area, with the careful design and siting of the student accommodation the impact upon the character of the Victoria Park Conservation Area and the setting of Langdale Hall can be preserved and that as a result the harm to both can be categorised as "less than substantial".

The Committee carefully considered all of the representations that had been made, but concluded that the negative impact of this development on the character of the Conservation area and the setting of Langdale Hall would be so great that any benefits of the scheme would be outweighed by the detriment to the Conservation area.

The recommendation was to approve the planning application but due to the fact that Committee has previously refused an identical application for the reason included within the report then the decision to refuse the application was able to be made without the requirement to bring the application back to a future meeting.

## **Decision**

To refuse to grant the application on the basis that the proposed development, due to its siting would be harmful to the spacious character and landscaped setting of the site and as a result would have a detrimental impact upon the character of the Victoria Park Conservation Area and the setting of Langdale Hall, contrary to Policies DM1 and EN3 in the Core Strategy and saved UDP Policies DC18 and DC19

### **PH/18/85. 119450/FO/2018 - The Old House At Home, 73 Burton Road, Manchester, M20 1HB**

Planning application 119450/FO/2018 for the erection of 12 no. four-bed, three-storey dwelling houses (Class C3) with associated parking, landscaping and boundary treatment following demolition of existing, vacant, public house was received.

This application was reported to the Committee on 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2018, as Committee resolved that it was minded to refuse the proposal, the application was deferred for the following reasons and asked that a report be brought back which addresses these concerns and provide for further consideration of potential reasons for refusal:

- Overdevelopment of the site
- Loss of privacy and impacts on residential amenity as a result

Officer confirmed that concerns have been raised with the applicant and amendments have been made to the proposal since first submitted. These amendments seek to address these concerns and have resulted in: the reduction of the number of dwellinghouses proposed from 13 to 12; reduction in height of the rear of the dwellinghouses by 1.4m; omission of rear balconies and second floor windows

to overcome issues of overlooking and loss of privacy; site layout changes to retain TPO trees and provide two terraces of 5 dwellings and a central pair of semi-detached properties with private driveways; the end property adjacent to No. 59 Burton Road has been reconfigured to improve the transition between the building line of the two properties; the overall height of the proposed houses has been reduced by 1.32m; and additional non-opening windows overlooking the recessed parking spaces.

Councillor White, in his capacity as Ward Councillor, spoke in objection to the proposals it is the view of the Councillors that the applicant is still proposing to build too much, too high and too close to existing houses and, therefore, the application should be refused on the grounds of overdevelopment and proximity to existing properties.

The applicant's agent spoke in support of the proposals, and said that the development had been changed significantly in reaction to the concerns raised by residents, and that he felt that all concerns would be comprehensively addressed by agreement with officers and robust conditions attached to any permission.

The Committee carefully considered all of the representations, and concluded that the additional conditions combined with the information provided by the applicant was sufficient to mitigate their previous concerns.

## **Decision**

To grant the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representation, with an additional condition regarding obscure glass to the windows at the rear of the properties.

*(Councillor White declared a prejudicial interest in this matter, and although he spoke in his capacity as Ward Councillor withdrew from the meeting while the matter was discussed and while the decision was made.)*

## **PH/18/86. 116871/FO/2017 - 118 Egerton Road North, Manchester, M16 0DA**

Planning application 116871/FO/2017 for the retention of dormer to rear to provide additional living accommodation was received.

The host property is split into 5 residential flats, all flats are accessed from Egerton Road North. The building constitutes a large two storey white rendered semi-detached property. The dormer that has been constructed is clad in white UPVC.

Councillor Watson spoke in her capacity as Ward Councillor to object to the proposals. She said that the dormer was of shoddy design and inappropriately overlooked neighbouring properties. The dormer had been erected without planning permission, and this application was as a result of residents raising concerns with officers. She acknowledged that dormers were a common feature, but this addition was badly built and disturbs the privacy of neighbours.

Officers confirmed that the application was as a result of a report of unauthorised development, and had invited the applicant to submit the application. Officers had visited the premises and assessed the structure, and concluded that the materials selected could have been of a better quality, however the material selection has not resulted in undue material harm to the host dwelling or to the character of the area or the visual amenities of surrounding property. The introduction of the dormer has not provided any further overlooking than from pre-existing windows to the rear elevation of the application property. The structure sits within the roofscape to the west of neighbouring property and would not be unduly overbearing or result in a loss of light to neighbouring property.

The Committee confirmed that this building contained 5 self contained dwellings, and was not an HMO.

## **Decision**

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report.

*(Councillor Watson declared a prejudicial interest in this matter, and although she spoke in her capacity as Ward Councillor withdrew from the meeting while the matter was discussed and while the decision was made. Councillor Watson took no further part in the rest of the meeting.)*

### **PH/18/87. 119242/FO/2018 & 119243/LO/2018 - 825 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M20 2SN**

Planning applications 119242/FO/2018 and 119243/LO/2018 for the Erection of 22 No. (2 x 3 bed, 18 x 4 bed, 2 x 5 bed) houses (C3), conversion of Parklands (use class B1a) to 39 No. (16 x 1 bed, 20 x 2 bed, 3 x 3 bed) apartments (C3), conversion of and extensions to The Cedars (use class B1a) to 21No (8 x 1 bed, 10 x 2 bed, 3 x 3 bed) apartments (C3), conversion of The Coach House into 2 No. (1 x 1 bed, 1 x 2 bed) houses (C3) and conversion of The Lodge into 1 No. (1 x 2 bed) house (C3), totalling 85 units, including demolition works, works to highways, provision of parking, landscaping and other associated works, and Listed Building Consent for the erection of 22 No. (2 x 3 bed, 18 x 4 bed, 2 x 5 bed) houses (C3), conversion of Parklands (use class B1a) to 39 No. (16 x 1 bed, 20 x 2 bed, 3 x 3 bed) apartments (C3), conversion of and extensions to The Cedars (use class B1a) to 21No (8 x 1 bed, 10 x 2 bed, 3 x 3 bed) apartments (C3), conversion of The Coach House into 2 No. (1 x 1 bed, 1 x 2 bed) houses (C3) and conversion of The Lodge into 1 No. (1 x 2 bed) house (C3), totalling 85 units, including demolition works, works to highways, provision of parking, landscaping and other associated works were received.

The immediate site is located in a predominately residential context with other uses nearby, such as the Towers Business Park and Francis House Children's Hospice. The site is not far removed from Didsbury Centre and the commercial properties associated with the A34, it lies in a highly sustainable location with access to the bus, Metrolink and Rail network.

The proposal would provide:

- 21 No (8 x 1 bed, 10 x 2 bed, 3 x 3 bed) apartments (C3) within The Cedars
- 39 No. (16 x 1 bed, 20 x 2 bed, 3 x 3 bed) apartments (C3) within Parklands
- 22 No. (2 x 3 bed, 18 x 4 bed, 2 x 5 bed) new build houses (C3)
- 2 No. (1 x 1 bed, 1 x 2 bed) houses (C3) within the conversion of the Coach House and 1 No. (1 x 2 bed) house (C3), within the conversion of the Lodge, totalling the provision of 85 residential units.

A local resident spoke in objection to the proposals and said the proposed development will result in very significant extra traffic congestion and pollution to an already congested and polluted area. Specific reference is made to increase in congestion and pollution at peak hours. Detailed concerns are expressed that the development and other developments will adversely impact upon the operation of the highway leading to gridlock. She said that there should be modifications to the travel plan to take account of the increased movement of vehicles, and that there should be an extension of double yellow lines to prevent inappropriate parking and obstruction of egress from the site.

The applicant's agent spoke in support of the proposals, and said that they had worked closely with officers to ensure that all the concerns had been fully addressed. The development would see the removal of large scale inappropriate extensions to Grade II listed building and large areas of hard standing that impact harmfully upon the setting of the Listed Buildings and the character of the Didsbury St James Conservation Area in favour of the introduction of landscaping and homes within the grounds. The proposals would not cause harm to the designated heritage assets in the form of the listed buildings or the Didsbury St James Conservation Area.

The applicant has undertaken a trip generation exercise using the TRICS database to establish the current and expected level of trips. The information provided suggests that there would be a significant reduction in the number of trips generated by the housing development when compared with the existing office use. In the AM peak there is expected to be a decrease of 103 no. 2 way trips and in the PM peak there would be a decrease of 78 no. 2 way trips.

TfGM have reviewed the trip generation exercise and agree the predicted trips are appropriate. Based on this it is accepted that there is likely to be a reduced impact on local highway operation and no further assessment is required.

Councillor Wilson, in his capacity as Ward Councillor, spoke in support of the concerns raised by residents and said that while he does not object to the principle of the development, travel patterns would need to be closely monitored to ensure that measures were appropriate and supported the safety of residents. He also said that the tree to be retained at the Wingate Drive elevation should be reassessed.

Councillor Wilson spoke in his capacity as Ward Councillor also said that the 3% contribution towards off site affordable housing was disappointing, and requested that after the units have been sold a reconciliation exercise should be undertaken to determine whether the S106 contribution could be increased.

Councillor Andrew Simcock also spoke in support of the resident's concerns and agreed with Councillor Wilson. He said that he was not opposed to the principle of

development, and recognised that this was an established and experienced operator. He also agreed that the viability assessment should be re-visited once all of the units were sold. He requested that consideration be given to using the S106 contribution not just for off site affordable housing but for community leisure facilities.

Officers confirmed that they would be happy to discuss the possibility of community facilities being provided from the S106 contribution.

The Committee expressed disappointment at the lack of affordable or Social housing provision under the terms of the proposals, and said that officers must be as robust as possible when negotiating S106 contributions.

### **Decision**

Minded to approve subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement relating to affordable housing provision, and the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representation.

*(Councillor Wilson declared a prejudicial interest in this matter, and although he spoke in his capacity as Ward Councillor withdrew from the meeting while the matter was discussed and while the decision was made.)*

This page is intentionally left blank