

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 27 August 2020

This Planning and Highways meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.

Present: Councillor Curley (Chair)

Councillors: Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Hitchen, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Madeline Monaghan, and White

Also Present:

Councillors O'Neill (written submission), Wheeler, Johns

PH/20/38 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications (126435/FO/2020, 126608/FO/2020 and 125871/LL/2020), since the agenda was issued, was circulated.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/20/39 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2020 as a correct record.

PH/20/40 126435/FO/2020 - 27 Trenchard Drive Manchester M22 5LZ - Woodhouse Park Ward

The application relates to the conversion of the existing dwelling to create two three bedroom dwellings; and the erection of two four bedroom dwellings with associated car parking and landscaping.

The application site measures 1.421m² in size and is located on the western side of Trenchard Drive. It is irregular in shape and consists of nos. 25 and 27/29 Trenchard Drive. No. 25 Trenchard Drive was a former garage that was converted into a dwellinghouse, without the benefit of planning permission, while nos. 27/29 Trenchard Drive, was originally a pair of semi-detached dwellings that was last used as a single residence (now vacant following a fire).

To the north of the site lies the landscaped buffer associated with a Manchester Airport operated long stay car park and to the west is an enclosed grass paddock associated with The Tatton Arms Public House which is located further south at the junction of Trenchard Drive and Ringway Road. To the south of the site stands a pair of semidetached dwellings. To the east of the site, on the opposite side of Trenchard Drive, there is a cleared plot of land (nos. 30-40 Trenchard Drive) which benefits from a planning permission for 15 dwellings (ref. 118924/JO/2018). The neighbourhood consists predominantly of two storey semi and terraced dwellings, though several commercial properties are located close to the junction of Trenchard Drive and Ringway Road, namely The Tatton Arms Public House, the Moss Nook Restaurant (currently vacant) and a detached two storey office premises called Moss Nook House.

The applicant is proposing the conversion of nos. 27/29 Trenchard Drive into a pair of 3 bed semi-detached dwellings, the erection of a rear dormer extension to nos. 27/29 Trenchard Drive, the erection of a 3 storey pair of 4 bed semi-detached dwellings to the side of nos. 27/29 Trenchard Drive, provision of 8 car parking spaces, 2 per dwelling and to facilitate the proposal the existing conservatory and no. 25 Trenchard Drive (the converted garage) would be demolished.

The Chair confirmed that Local Ward Councillor O'Neill had requested that the Committee consider a site visit and would have spoken on the Item but had problems accessing the virtual committee meeting.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to present the Item.

A Planning Officer requested that the Committee draw their attention to the supplementary information provided for broader context on the plans for this development.

The Chair invited an objector to speak.

The objector also requested that the Committee make a site visit and the Chair confirmed that that request had been received via a Local Ward Councillor and would be addressed within the meeting.

The Chair invited the agent for the applicant to speak and the applicant's agent addressed the Committee with information about the application.

The Chair invited a Planning Officer to speak.

The Planning Officer referred to the reduction of dwellings explaining that this was due to concerns over the visual aspect and issues regarding car parking and stated that the reduction will add to the space available on the site making more green space and availability for two car parking spaces for each property. The Planning Officer stated that the design was in keeping with other properties along Trenchard Drive with a similar gable end feature. The Planning Officer explained that there were no concerns from Highways regarding traffic.

The Chair invited the members of the committee to speak

Councillor Lyons raised concerns of over-development and construction plans of the proposal due to its location within a small community and proposed a site visit to achieve a better understanding of the development and its potential impact on the local community in terms of road use by construction vehicles.

Councillor Lovecy seconded the proposal for a site visit to address any concerns, mentioning that the dwelling spaces will double from two to four, but welcomed the reduction in the development from five to four properties.

A Planning Officer then addressed the issue of construction management stating that there had been a condition for a full construction management plan to be agreed which requests evidence that residents have been consulted.

The Committee voted and gave its support for a site visit.

Decision

To defer consideration of the matter to allow a site visit to be carried out by the members of the Committee.

PH/20/41 125655/FO/2019 - Water Street, Manchester M3 4JQ - Deansgate Ward

The application relates to a site, known as T1, is 0.32 hectares and bounded by Water Street, Manchester Goods Yard, and Grape Street. It is accessed from Water Street and is in use as a construction site for Manchester Goods Yard. The original planning permission (114385/FO/2016) approved the Manchester Goods Yard offices and a residential 'Tower (T1)'. Manchester Goods Yard is under construction and this proposal would replace the 'T1' element of that permission. The site is in the Castlefield Conservation Area and is part of a Masterplan and Strategic Regeneration Framework.

At its meeting on 30 July 2020 the Committee resolved that it was 'minded to refuse' the application on the grounds that the number of units proposed was too large and it did not provide sufficient parking for disabled people. They requested officers to bring a report to the next meeting which addresses these concerns.

This proposal would supersede the Tower 1 element of the previous permission with a 32 storey building comprising 390 Co-Living Apartments with 210no. 2-, 3- and 4-bed shared apartments and 180no. studios with 870 Bedspaces. There would be ancillary amenity space on four floors consisting of residents' amenity space, a gym, commercial space, and self storage. There would be 152 cycle spaces in the building and 40 sheffield stands in the public realm.

80% of the 870 bedspaces would be within the Duo, Trio or Quad units which would all be single occupancy. The Duo, Trio and Quad (2, 3 and 4 bed) units could be a primary residence and would only be available on tenancies from 6-months upwards. When single occupancy is taken into account, each of the shared units meets or

exceeds NDSS, without taking into account access to shared amenity. Bedroom areas would provide as much useable floorspace as possible. Each apartment will have a shared communal kitchen and lounge. The studios would be available solely on short-term lets, up to 6 months in length, so would not be a primary residence. This would be controlled via the Section 106 Agreement.

The Chair invited a Planning Officer to make comment on the application.

A Planning Officer stated that they had looked at addressing the Committee's concerns following the previous Committee meeting on 30 July 2020, stating that the applicant had secured 35 car parking spaces in an adjacent building for the sole use of disabled parking for both buildings, namely T1 (minded to refuse at the previous committee meeting) and T2 (approved at the previous committee meeting). The Planning Officer confirmed that if T1 were not approved then the disabled parking spaces would not be available for T2. The Planning Officer informed the Committee that the scheme was in keeping with the Executive resolution and that if the Co-living scheme were to be subject to a more dispersed approach it would use up more land and have a broader consequence on other requirements for commercial space in the St John's area and create a larger challenge in managing a series of smaller schemes compared to the single purpose building presented in this application.

The Planning Officer then confirmed that the scheme approved by the Committee (T2) accommodated a larger number of occupants than the scheme being considered here (T1). The Planning Officer then addressed previous concerns of the Committee around the longevity of the project and any future plans for the building should the Co-living scheme not deliver and stated that the applicant had provided a conversion plan, to a mainstream living purpose, which would be put in place in the event that the initial purpose was not successful. The Planning Officer then informed the Committee that the more affordable accommodation in the building was set within units comprising of larger spaced dwellings and that the studios were to be the more costly. The Planning Officer's final comment was that, due to the approval of the linked scheme at T2, Planning Officers did not feel that a refusal from the Committee could be substantiated.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

A Member of the Committee sought clarity on what tenants options would be when they were ready to co-habit with a partner, for instance, and the Planning Officer responded to the Member that the dwellings in this scheme were all for the purpose of single occupancy.

Members expressed concerns over whether the Manchester spatial standards were being met, the proposals of ensuring short term tenancies of six months maximum were maintained and that the proposal is untested.

Councillor Lyons proposed the application be minded to refuse on grounds of inadequate living space and that it is counterintuitive to the cautious approach set out in the Executive report.

Councillor Lovecy seconded the proposal stating that there was a further consideration to take into account regarding Coronavirus when dealing with shared dwelling spaces, stating that it would require several tenants to self-isolate in the event of one occupant contracting the virus.

The Planning Officer addressed the concerns stating that the space requirements were met within the dwellings with potential to be permanent and that only the dwellings with a maximum six month tenancy did not meet the standards. The Planning Officer referred to concerns around Coronavirus stating that the accommodation may not be available commercially for four years.

The Director of Planning made comment on the Committee's previous minded to refuse decision stating that that decision had been made on the basis of the lack of disabled car parking and that the matter had now been addressed and it was now felt that there was no reason for refusal which could be substantiated.

The Committee voted and gave support to the decision to minded to refuse.

Decision

Minded to refuse on the basis that the number and size of co-living units are in conflict with current space standard and the terms set out within the Co-living in Manchester report to the Executive (3 July 2020).

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/20/42 125573/FO/2019 - Plot 11 First Street, Deansgate Ward Comprising Land Bound by Hulme Street to the North, Wilmott Street to the East, the Unite Parkway Gate Development and Mancunian Way to the South and Medlock Street to the West, Manchester - Deansgate Ward

This application is for the construction of four buildings of heights varying from 10 storeys to 45 storeys together comprising Co-living bedspaces (use class Sui Generis) and associated amenity facilities, with ground floor commercial units (Use classes A3 (Café / Restaurant and D2 (Gym)), private amenity space and public realm comprising hard and soft landscaping, car parking and cycle facilities and other associated works.

Consideration of this application was deferred at the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on 30 July 2020 to enable a site visit to take place to allow Members to assess the impact that the proposed development would have on nearby listed buildings. The site visit was undertaken on the morning of 27 August 2020.

A Planning Officer addressed the Committee with information about the application.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

A Local Ward Councillor gave objection to the proposal on the grounds of the height of the buildings with the tallest being two storeys shorter than the Beetham Tower which the Local Ward Councillor felt was not in keeping with this area, stating that First Street was comprised of mid-rise towers of public realm usage. The Local Ward Councillor further stated that the development would overshadow areas of Deansgate and Hulme and sit uneasily with the immediately local aspects of Manchester's industrial history. The Local Ward Councillor made comment that the Co-living aspect is in conflict with current space standard and felt concerned around the impact of the Coronavirus restrictions when applied to living in such dwellings. Further comment was made about the large increase of population in this Local Ward from this development alone and how that would present with more traffic and round the clock disturbances from food deliveries and taxis. In conclusion the Local Ward Councillor stated that whilst the open green space proposed as part of the development was welcomed, it was outweighed by the harm that allowing this application would present on the local surrounding area.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to address the concerns of the Local Ward Councillor.

The Planning Officer questioned the comment that the building was too tall by stating that the site was situated at the main gateway entrance to the City Centre from the Airport and South Manchester motorway network and that this would be a prime location for such a development, being built on open land and away from the more historic aspects of the City Centre. The Planning Officer requested that the Committee take note of the inclusion of a park on the site and that the site in its current state was overdue for development.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

A Member raised concerns around the close proximity of this development to listed buildings at Mackintosh Mill and Cambridge Street Mill, the loss of residential amenities in the north side of Hulme, the potential for a conversion plan if the Co-living scheme was not successful, if short term tenancies for Co-living (i.e. 2 weeks) were to be considered and any arrangements concerning the access and egress of vehicles to and from the site.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to address the Member's concerns.

The Planning Officer stated that the closest aspect of the proposed development to the listed buildings is lower than the previous proposal for this site and lower than other consented similar schemes. Addressing the issue of a conversion plan the Planning Officer confirmed that this had been taken into account and would not require any structural work. On the subject of short term lettings the Planning Officer confirmed that this type of arrangement is already occurring in the City Centre in serviced apartments and hotels and that the Co-living method of living addressed the needs of this style of living arrangement. In conclusion the Planning Officer confirmed that there is an access strategy for the First Street site as a whole.

Further concerns were raised by a Member on the previous proposal for this site having provision for a Primary School and a medical practice which was not included in this proposal, having a public green space instead. The Member questioned the lack of residential community facilities.

The Planning Officer responded to address the concerns and state that a development nearby would house a Primary School and that previously the implied demand for public use amenities was underused and led to empty commercial units finally adding that the inclusion of green, open space would be easily accessible from Hulme.

Councillor Davies proposed the committee be minded to refuse the application and this was seconded by Councillor Lyons.

The Committee voted and gave their support to the decision of minded to refuse.

(Councillor Monaghan abstained from vote due to a poor internet connection which did not allow her to take part in the full consideration of the application).

Decision

Minded to refuse on the basis of the impact on neighbouring residential areas in Hulme and also the development is in conflict with policies on current space standard and previous reports from the Executive.

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.

(Councillor N Ali left the meeting at this point and did not return).

PH/20/43 126608/FO/2020 - Land to the South of Store Street, Manchester, M1 2NE - Piccadilly Ward

This application is regarding the erection of part 4, part 11 storey residential (Class C3) development (with roof top plant room) comprising 66 (Class C3) residential units (3 x 2 bed town houses, 46 x two bed apartments and 17 x one bed apartments) together with associated car parking (10 spaces including 5 Electric Vehicle Charging spaces), cycle parking (66 spaces) communal roof terrace (level 6), landscaping and ancillary infrastructure including rooftop PV solar panels, alterations to access onto Store Street

The site is 0.1 hectares and bounded by Store Street, the Ashton Canal, the 3 storey William Jessop Court, a retaining wall and the junction of Millbank Street and Store Street. The elevated Ashton canal passes the southern boundary and crosses Store Street on an aqueduct, which is grade II* listed. The site is 200 m North West of Piccadilly Station and is close to all sustainable transport options. The site is in Flood Risk Zone 1 (low risk) and is within a critical drainage area.

The application proposes the erection of part 4, part 11 storey building comprising 66 shared ownership homes (100% affordable) delivered through a joint venture with a registered provider. It would include 3 two bed town houses, 46 two bed apartments and 17 one bed apartments.

20% of the affordable homes would be secured through a S106 Agreement and the remaining 80% as a condition of grant funding from Homes England. The shared ownership housing model requires that the homes would be available for purchase at between 25% and 75% of market value. Occupiers who have entered into a Shared Ownership Lease would be allowed to 'staircase' to full ownership.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee with information about the application.

The Chair invited a Local Ward Councillor to speak on the application.

A Ward Councillor gave support to the application giving mention to it being a proposal of 100 percent affordable housing by Government definition and 20 percent genuinely affordable by the Manchester definition. The Ward Councillor welcomed the addition of City Centre premises that were classed as affordable and the two to one provision on tree planting whereby any one tree removed to develop the site would be replaced with two.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Councillor Lyons confirmed that he had declared an interest on the Item and was speaking as a Local Ward Councillor, not as a Member of the Committee. Councillor Lyons stated that this was the result of Local Ward Councillors putting their values and principles in action and thanked the applicants for working together with them to realise this vision of affordable housing in the City Centre. Councillor Lyons then left the meeting and took no part in the debate or vote on this item.

The Chair again invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

A Member spoke in support of the application on the basis of affordable housing on a shared ownership scheme and the two to one provision on tree planting.

A Member asked if there was any provision in place to halt any property developers purchasing any of the dwellings to sell for a profit.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the S106 scheme would prevent multiple acquisitions of any of the properties.

Councillor Y Dar made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor Kamal.

The Committee took a vote and gave their support to the decision to agree the recommendation

Decision

Minded to approve the application, subject to a legal agreement in respect of securing the provision of 20% on site affordable housing (shared ownership – aligned with Manchester’s average income level) and subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted and the Late Representations submitted.

PH/20/44 125871/LL/2020 - 42 - 46 Thomas Street (including 41-45 Back Turner Street) Manchester M4 1ER - Piccadilly Ward

This application is in regard to the demolition of 42, 44 and 46 Thomas Street (including 41, 43 and 45 Back Turner Street) to facilitate redevelopment of the wider site under extant planning permission and listed building consent ref: 113475/FO/2016 and 113476/LO/2016

Planning permission and listed building consent were granted in August 2017 to develop a site bounded by Thomas Street, Kelvin Street and Back Turner Street. The scheme incorporated 7 Kelvin Street, a grade II listed building, but removed the 3 storey former weaver’s cottages known as 42-46 Thomas Street (including 41, 43 and 45 Back Turner Street). 7 Kelvin Street is on the City Council’s local Buildings at Risk list.

Due to the particular circumstances of the matter a site visit had been arranged for members which took place in the morning prior to the committee meeting.

The meeting was informed that the Weavers Cottages referred to were not then listed but they were considered to be non-designated heritage assets. The impact of their loss was properly considered in the context of national and local planning policies. They have been heavily altered internally and much original fabric and character has been lost.

The application approved the erection of a 4/5 storey building that retained and incorporated the Grade II Listed 7 Kelvin Street, to provide 20 dwellings, with active ground floor uses, following the demolition of numbers 42 to 46 Thomas Street (113475).

A related application for listed building consent approved alterations and repair and change of use of 7 Kelvin Street to 3 apartments as part of a 4/5 storey residential development (113476).

In July 2018, following the acquisition of the site, the Weavers cottages were designated as Grade II Listed. As such all remaining buildings on-site are now grade-II listed. Applications to discharge pre-commencement conditions on the site have been submitted and are currently under consideration

The Chair invited a Planning Officer to introduce the Item.

The Planning Officer requested the Committee take note of a minor amendment in the supplementary agenda.

The Chair then invited the applicant to speak and the applicant addressed the Committee with information about the application.

A Ward Councillor spoke in objection to the proposed demolition and redevelopment of the site, stating that the grade-II listed buildings in question consist of three mill workers cottages and are survivors of Manchester's industrial and working class heritage. The Ward Councillor gave mention to Historic England having submitted a representation which detailed why they felt the demolition should not be allowed and that Historic England believed there was still a viable use for the buildings in their current state. The Ward Councillor requested the Committee consider a decision of minded to refuse to facilitate further investigations on how the buildings could be developed without losing their heritage character, giving further mention of Heritage England's alleged intention of appealing any proposed demolition and redevelopment.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Councillor Lyons confirmed that he had declared an interest on the Item and was speaking as a Ward Councillor, not as a Member of the Committee. Councillor Lyons made comment that the application was not for renovation but for demolition of a grade-II listed building, stating that the site was structurally sound and inferred that the redevelopment application was for a larger net gain. Councillor Lyons stated that the objection received from Heritage England was one of the strongest he had known in his time as a Ward Councillor. Councillor Lyons requested a motion of minded to refuse and stated that, if achieved, he and other Ward Councillors would work with the developers to facilitate the renovation of these grade-II listed buildings. Councillor Lyons then left the meeting and took no part in the debate or vote on this item.

The Chair invited a Planning Officer to speak on the application.

The Planning Officer gave mention to Heritage England having stated that the loss of the grade-II listed buildings would be considered as substantial harm and that the scheme would be viable if the buildings were kept. The Planning Officer informed the Committee that if they were in approval of the proposal the decision could only be as minded to approve as the matter would then need to be referred to the Secretary of State. The Planning Officer then stated that the situation was unique in that the plot had been purchased and planning permission approved prior to the buildings receiving their heritage status.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Members spoke of the useful site visit they had attended and expressed their concern over the proposed demolition of what is now listed as part of Manchester's industrial and working class heritage.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to make a comment.

The Planning Officer stated that the listed building status was confirmed two years ago and that no other scheme had presented itself prior to this application further

stating that there had been a notable volume of objections received in the run up to the committee meeting.

Councillor Lovecy proposed the Committee be minded to refuse and this was seconded by Councillor S Ali.

Decision

Minded to refuse on the basis that demolition would be contrary to policies on the conservation of historic assets in the city which represent Manchester's working class heritage.

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/20/45 127142/FO/2020 - Land to the East of the Fairway Manchester M40 3WS - Moston Ward

The application site relates to an open piece of land situated along The Fairway within a predominantly residential area of Moston in North Manchester. The site is bounded by residential to the north, east and the west, with Moston Brook Recreational Space to the east. The site is accessed via The Fairway.

The proposal site is irregular in shape with the frontage being narrower than the remainder of the site which opens up as it goes further rearward. It is immediately bounded to the north east of the application site by a sub-station and a detached property identified as no. 51 The Fairway. Moston Brook Recreational Space lies immediately to the south of the site, and to the east residential properties on West Avenue and opposite the site and to the east are residential properties relating to The Fairway.

Currently the frontage of the site is bounded by low timber rail fencing erected by the applicant and connects to the dry stone wall that returns partially along the eastern boundary with the pathway running through to Moston Brook Recreational Space. There is no formal vehicular access to the site with the main access being pedestrianised.

The submitted application proposes the erection of one 2 storey dwellinghouse (Class C3) with associated parking, landscaping and boundary treatment.

The Chair invited the applicant to speak and the applicant addressed the Committee with information about the application.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Members welcomed the proposal and the zero loss of trees on the site.

Councillor Lyons moved the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor S Ali.

Decision

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