

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 24 September 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 M Dar, O'Neill and Wheeler

#### **PH/20/46      Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications (126431/FO/2020, 125596/FO/2019, 127053/FO/2020 and 126435/FO/2020), since the agenda was issued, was circulated.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/20/47 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2020 as a correct record subject to the inclusion of Councillors Riasat and Watson in the list of apologies given at the meeting.

#### **PH/20/48      126431/FO/2020 - Site South of Sportcity Way, East of Joe Mercer Way, West of Alan Turing Way And North of the Ashton Canal at the Etihad Campus Manchester - Ancoats and Beswick Ward**

The application proposes a multi-use arena comprising 68,608 sqm of floorspace with ancillary retail, food and beverage uses.

This 4.46 hectare site is used as a 500 space overspill car park for events at the Etihad stadium. The site is secured with a mesh fence on all sides and contains a number of self-seeded trees and shrubs. Its topography is relatively flat with a gentle slope from south to north before the site drops steeply down to the Ashton Canal.

The site is bounded by Joe Mercer Way (an elevated pedestrian walkway connecting to the Etihad Stadium) which separates the site from the Manchester Tennis and Football Centre located further west, Alan Turing Way, a four lane road with segregated cycle lanes is to the east with the Ashton Canal and the Etihad Metrolink stop to the south.

The applicant's aim is to develop the best arena in Europe in Manchester that would attract the world's top events and shows. They aim to set new standards in terms of arena design and environmental sustainability.

The design would be unique and enable the main auditorium to operate in a variety of different seating modes and host different entertainment and leisure events including music, sport, performances, awards ceremonies and other live entertainment. Its capacity would normally be 20,000 but could be extended to 23,500 for events where a centre stage configuration is used.

The arena would host events on scheduled days throughout the week and year. The operational strategy could occasionally result in events taking place at the same time or same day as football events at the Etihad Stadium. The associated impacts of this are considered in detail in the report.

The auditorium would be custom designed for a much more compact, flexible and intimate configuration compared to comparable capacity venues. The lower tier of the seating bowl would have retractable seating that could be configured in a variety of ways in maximise the spectator experience. The upper tier would project and be lower to the heart of the auditorium to enable a more intimate spectator experience.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to present the Item.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that additional information had been provided within the 'Supplementary Information on Applications' document, previously circulated. Reference was made to representations received from the Manchester Arena and Printworks to have the application referred to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to decide whether the application should be called in for determination, if the Committee was minded to Approve. The Planning Officer reported that all aspects of the scheme had been addressed and this was detailed within the planning report. Reference was made to a representation received from the Executive Vice President of ASM Global (operating company of Manchester Arena), regarding the impact of the development on the Manchester Arena, and which requested the Committee to consider the impact of the application in line with the concerns of other city centre stakeholders. In addition it was reported that the £100million investment planned for the Manchester Arena by ASM Global, may not be justified if the application was approved.

A further representation from ASM Global had suggested that the Market Assessment had not been properly considered by the Council's independent advisor. The planning Officer confirmed that the Council's independent advisors had reviewed the additional work and had confirmed in writing that it did not fundamentally alter their advice that there is robust evidence to support the proposal.

The Committee was advised that if the Committee was Minded to Approve the application, the approval notice would not be issued until the Secretary of State had considered the application.

The Chair invited an objector to speak.

The objector spokesperson addressed the Committee on behalf of ASM Global and other interested stakeholders. Concern was expressed on the impact of the application on the sustainability and vitality of the city centre economy. In addition, concern was expressed on the matters not included within the planning report that were raised in the late representation that had been left unanswered relating to growth in the market and the split from the city centre. The point was made that the forecasts produced in the application had yet to be tested and needed to be fully understood before a decision could be made. Other issues raised related to the impact of the application on the Manchester Arena and the planned investment of £100million by ASM Global. In addition, reference was made to policy C9 which seeks to protect the city centre and the East Manchester Regeneration Framework which was produced to complement the city centre offer. The Committee was advised that the Manchester Arena had the capacity to meet expansion and growth in the market. The application did not provide links to the city centre similar to the Manchester Arena and took potential trade away from city centre businesses.

The Chair invited the applicant's agent to speak on the application. In response to the points raised in the representations it was stated that there is sustainable growth in the market for two city arenas. Other cities have recognised growth in these markets and this would be sustained in Manchester through the increase of the population over the next fifteen years. The evidence produced has been robustly tested independently and this has indicated that the visitor spend generated by a second arena would benefit the city centre economy. It was hoped that a new arena will help spur the operators of the Manchester Arena to invest in the facility and provide the city with two high quality entertainment venues.

A ward councillor addressed the Committee and reported that other ward councillor and local residents in surrounding wards have welcomed the application and supportive recognising the benefits this will bring to the surrounding ward areas such as job creation and apprenticeships.

A ward councillor welcomed the application and referred to the importance of maintaining balance between the two arenas and businesses in the city centre. Reference was made to the positives which the development would bring to East Manchester in the form of jobs during and after construction and the potential of attracting further investment to the area. It was hoped that Manchester Arena could continue to be a world class venue and a second arena could complement this.

A ward councillor referred to parking arrangements for local residents and sought an assurance that there would be no cost to residents or the Council. In welcoming the application and the positive benefit it provides for local residents through jobs and training opportunities, the councillor considered it reasonable that the city could accommodate two arenas. Officers were asked for clarification regarding the overlap of events being held at the new arena and football matches arranged for the Etihad

Stadium and the traffic plan to deal with the large numbers of attendees and vehicles this would attract.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to comment and asked questions.

A member in welcoming the application and the benefits it would bring to the area and local economy also asked officers to explain the arrangements in place to deal with events at both the arena and the Etihad Stadium.

The Planning Officer responded by explaining that the evidence that has been presented to the Committee had been analysed and the conclusion from this suggests that two arenas could operate successfully in the city. Officers are currently working with the operators of the Manchester Arena regarding their investment proposals which will take a phased approach. The residents parking zone intended for the area around the application site will be set up and operated at no cost to the Council and is subject to a Section 106 agreement. With reference to events clashing on the same day at the arena and the Etihad Stadium, it was reported that special measures would be introduced such as to stagger the start and finish times at each venue. Attendees would also be advised that limited parking would be available and sustainable transport options would be encouraged as well as improvements being made to the three existing walking routes from the city centre.

Officers were asked for clarification on the operation of a travel plan and in view of location of the site of the proposal being on the former Bradford coal mine, could an assurance be given on the safety of the development and impact on surrounding residential homes. With regard to the public realm works in the application would the trees planted be mature trees.

It was reported that the travel plan would be reviewed annually by the Council and the venue operators. The Coal Authority had been consulted on the proposal and was satisfied that the issues raised can be addressed within the application. The Committee was informed that details of the public realm works had yet to be finalised but it was expected that the trees to be planted would be mature/semi mature.

A member referred to the consideration of market assessments as part of the application and asked officers for guidance on this.

It was reported that the application presents a large proposal and market assessment is a material consideration. The applicants have provided a detailed assessment and so had the objectors and the Council had engaged an independent consultant to provide advice. The advice received was there is a market available for two arena venues. The proposed venue would look to facilitate more diverse formats and layouts than the existing arena to open Manchester to different types of event and in doing so would attract a wider regional/national audience and provide a balance to the national economy.

A member referred to a community fund for the three local wards affected by the proposal and asked how this would be monitored. The Committee was informed that this was included in the draft S106 agreement but it was not a material planning consideration and members of the Committee should not consider it in their decision.

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

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

## Decision

**Minded to Approve** subject to:-

- i) the signing of a section 106 agreement with regards to the review and expansion of the existing Residents Parking Zone (RPZ), an operational event management strategy, walking route improvement works, local labour commitments and waste management arrangements.
- ii) confirmation that the Secretary of State does not intend to call the application in for his own determination.
- iii) Revision to condition 15 as follows:

*15) Prior to the first use of the arena hereby approved, a strategy for use of the ancillary spaces throughout the arena building, including kiosks to the canal (as shown on drawing BRA-POP-ZZ-01-DR-A-0613 Rev 00 stamped as received by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, on the 6 March 2020), on non-arena event days shall be submitted for approval in writing by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority.*

*For the avoidance of doubt, this shall include details of the nature of the uses which would take place within the ancillary spaces including which facilities/spaces would be made available, the amount of floorspace to be utilised, operating hours and any management arrangements to ensure authorised access to the arena building only.*

*The use of the ancillary spaces on non-arena event days shall be carried out in accordance with this strategy for as long as the arena is in use.*

*Reason – To facilitate the use of the ancillary spaces on non-arena event days for community use and other appropriate purposes including kiosks to the canal which would support natural surveillance and activity at the arena and Etihad Campus as part of supporting the vitality of the campus and community access to the building pursuant to policies SP1, EC7 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).*

(Councillor Flanagan declared a personal and pecuniary interest in the application and spoke as a Ward Councillor and took no part in the consideration of the application.)

(Councillor Hitchen declared a personal and pecuniary interest in the application and spoke as a Ward Councillor and took no part in the consideration of the application.)

(Councillor Monaghan did not take part in the consideration of the application or vote.)

**PH/20/49 126944/FO/2020 - Land Bound by Dantzic Street, Gould Street, Williamson Street and Bromley Street (Known As Victoria Riverside) Manchester – Cheetham Ward**

This application is for a proposal comprising 3 residential tower buildings of 37, 18 and 26 storeys above two 6 storey podiums on Dantzic Street to form 634 homes. 611 would be apartments with 13 townhouses and 10 maisonettes. 35% would be one bedroom, 55% two bedroom and 10% 3 bedroom offering a range of choice and accommodation would be attractive to families as well as smaller households.

The tower A, at 37 storeys, is at the junction of Gould Street and Dantzic Street followed by the tower B at 18 storey tower and the tower C at 26 storey tower. The distances between the towers has been maximised for privacy and to maximise views. A lower level block, 6 storey block on Dantzic Street and Bromley Street would include townhouses, maisonettes and commercial uses creating front doors onto the street.

Shared indoor and outdoor amenity spaces would be created on two podiums with private and semi-private amenity space and balconies. Podium A is the south of Bromley Street adjacent to Tower A. Podium B is located to the east of Bromley Street between towers B and C.

This 0.97 hectares vacant site is bounded by Dantzic Street, Gould Street, a railway viaduct and a warehouse unit. It is bisected by Bromley Street which lies in a northwest-southeast orientation. Bromley Street is closed.

The Planning Officer had nothing further to add to the application.

No objector was present at the meeting.

The applicant's representative spoke to the Committee on the application.

The Chair invited member of the Committee to comment on the application.

Members referred to the design of the proposal and officers were asked if the design was age friendly to enable residents to age in place and officers were asked if the proposal would include a local labour agreement to provide employment opportunities for local people.

The Committee was informed that there are a number of types and styles of accommodation proposed including houses and apartments gardens which would be suitable for all age groups. In addition, the Committee was informed that the S106 agreement did include a local labour agreement.

In welcoming the application the Chair noted that the development would include 20% affordable housing across the development.

Councillor S Ali made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor M Watson.

The Committee supported the recommendation.

### **Decision**

Minded to Approve subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement in relation to affordable housing and the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted.

### **PH/20/50      125596/FO/2019 - Land Bounded by Hulme Hall Lane, Varley Street, Iron Street, Coleshill Street and Rochdale Canal Manchester M40 8HH - Miles Platting & Newton Heath Ward**

This application relates to a housing-led mixed use development. It involves 410 new dwellings (Class C3) and 744sq.m of commercial floorspace comprising Class A1 (retail), Class A3 (restaurant/cafe) Class B1 (business/office use), together with recreation open space and landscaping, infrastructure provision and car parking. Following recent changes to planning legislation, the Class A1, A3 and B1 uses now fall within use Class E and the title of the application has been changed accordingly.

There would be a variety of house types ranging in size and design (2 bedroom 4 person, three bedroom 4 person, three bedroom five person and three bedroom six person houses) along with 107 apartments. All would meet the Council's approved space standards.

The development would include two blocks of apartments located along the south western boundary of the site adjacent to Varley Street, close to the junction with Holland Street, with a further two blocks fronting onto Hulme Hall Lane in proximity to Coleshill Street. The apartment blocks would be part four, part five, and five storeys in height. The rest of the site would then include the dwellinghouses, which would be either 2 or 3 storeys in height.

The layout would be in the form of a gird iron pattern of buildings with the majority of houses facing onto the street (some terraces facing the canal would face onto pedestrian routes which link to the proposed highways). Each would have a small rear garden and access to larger shared courtyard areas which would include some off street parking provision. These areas would be secured, On street parking controlled by the use of permits is also proposed.

A range of different tenures are included, build to rent and affordable housing being delivered through a registered provider (One Manchester). Overall there would be 36 Shared Ownership, 34 Affordable Rent, 44 rent to buy and 296 Build to Rent

The proposed commercial floorspace would primarily be located at ground floor level within the apartment block fronting onto Hulme Hall, the café element of the scheme would be located at ground level facing onto the canal with a flat above.

As noted there would be a new highway network into and around the site, which would connect Hulme Hall Lane in an east west direction to Varley Street. Car parking has been provided at a provision of 310 parking spaces, 438 cycle spaces and 22 parking spaces for disabled users which are all included within the proposed development. Parking for the most part is in the form of on street bays and would be managed through a residents permit scheme.

Associated landscaping, boundary treatments, new highways with street trees, and significant site remediation is also proposed. The layout of the site incorporates seven key areas of open space each with its own distinct character but which would create a chain of practical and useable space for future and existing residents.

The scheme would also necessitate the provision of a number of substations within the overall site.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to present the Item.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that additional information had been provided within the 'Supplementary Information on Applications' document, previously circulated. The Committee was informed that an objection had been received from a ward councillor regarding the loss of football pitches and recreational land. As a result of concerns raised an amendment was recommended to be made to the legal agreement to include a payment for the provision of recreational /sports facilities, with the current green space to remain in use until any new or upgraded facility becomes available. In recognising the potential for a 'rat run' through the development it is proposed that a further condition is added with the condition wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee. In addition, Condition 7 of the application, referencing offsite highways works on Traffic Regulation Orders would need to be amended to reflect the additional condition. Significant alterations to the canal frontage have been proposed by the applicant and agreed by the Canals and Waterways Trust including the removal of railings and the addition of new access points and these would be subject to an amendment to the existing proposed conditions to ensure full details of accessible access points to the canal are first agreed. A number of remediation works were also proposed and contained within the supplementary information. The recommendation to the Committee remained Minded to Approve subject to the amendment to the legal agreement and the inclusion of further condition and changes to the existing conditions as outlined.

No objector attended the meeting.

The applicant's representative addressed the Committee on the application.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments on the application.

A member welcomed the proposal and the opportunity that it would bring to the area but expressed concern on the lack of consultation with local councillors by officers. In addition, concern was expressed regarding a potential rat run through the development which had not been identified in the report. An assurance was sought for a physical barrier would be installed to reduce vehicle speed to protect



pedestrians and better access to the Rochdale Canal for the public. The Committee was informed that there are three pitches as part of the green space and no contact had been made with Sport England on the proposal to remove the pitches. It was requested that any financial agreement be in consultation with local councillors and would benefit local residents. The proposal was welcomed for the reasons that it will provide affordable good quality housing and use a brown field site requiring significant remediation works.

The planning Officer gave an assurance that the additional condition would address the concern of a 'rat run' and the legal agreement would be robustly worded to address the loss of green space and provision of a new or upgraded facility.

A member referred to the use of parking permits as part of the proposal and expressed concern that this may push parking onto existing residential areas and needed to be addressed to prevent it. Reference was also made on the lack of timely consultation with ward councillors on the application. Officers were asked to include ward councillors in the consideration of the additional highways condition.

The Planning Officer reported that the adopted roads within the controlled parking zone would subject to the existing wider controlled parking zone. Private roads would be subject to parking management measures on match days.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

Director of Planning noted the concerns of members regarding consultations and offered to bring together officers from the service areas concerned to meet with local councillors to work through and address the concerns that had been raised.

A member took issue with the statement from the applicant's agent that local councillors had been consulted and stated that this was not the case. The Chair was requested to write to the Chief Executive to highlight the issues on consultation and involvement of local councillors arising from the application to ensure they are not repeated in future applications.

Councillor G White made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor J Flanagan.

The Committee supported the recommendation.

## **Decision**

1. **Minded to Approve** – subject to a section 106 legal agreement and amendment as outlined relating to a payment towards improved /new facilities to replace the green space to be lost, a clause relating to the timing of delivery of these facilities, a mechanism to re-test the viability of the development in relation to the delivery of affordable housing, should there be a delay in the implementation of the planning permission, together with a further review prior to the occupation of the development, and to finance the future administration, enforcement and maintenance of the residents permit parking scheme. An additional condition to address the creation of a 'rat run' within the development and also rewording of

existing proposed conditions in order that details of accessible access points to the canal are agreed, with the wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning and the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee a subject to the additional conditions outlined in the supplementary information document.

2. That the Director of Planning facilitate a meeting with local ward councillors and officers involved in the areas of service concerned to address issues that have been identified relating to traffic calming measures arrangements to maintain access to green and recreational space and public access to the Rochdale Canal.

**PH/20/51      127053/FO/2020 - Vacant Land on the corner of Victory Street and Claremont Road Manchester M14 5AE - Moss Side Ward**

This application relates to the erection of four two storey houses with associated car parking and landscaping. The application site comprises vacant land (previously used to accommodate residential housing until between 1961 and 1979) measuring 923m<sup>2</sup> in size.

The land is currently in an unkempt condition, it currently features a number of trees and a significant area of dense vegetation undergrowth, it is located on the west side of Victory Street near to its junction with Claremont Road. The site is located in Moss Side Ward.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to introduce the application. The Planning Officer informed the Committee that additional information had been provided within the 'Supplementary Information on Applications' document, previously circulated. There was no further information to present on the application.

There was no objector to the application and the applicant did not attend the meeting.

Councillor M Watson made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor J Flanagan.

**Decision**

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

**PH/20/52      126435/FO/2020 - 27 Trenchard Drive Manchester M22 5LZ  
Woodhouse Park**

The application site relates to the conversion of the existing dwelling to create 2 no. three bedroom dwellings; and the erection of 2 x 4 bedroom dwellings with associated car parking and landscaping.

This application was placed before the Planning and Highways Committee on 27 August 2020 and at that meeting the committee deferred deliberation in order to allow Members to undertake a site visit due to concerns about overdevelopment and the impact on the community from construction vehicles.

The application site measures 1,421m<sup>2</sup> 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, albeit 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).

The Committee had undertaken a site visit to view the development site and surrounding area.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that additional information had been provided within the 'Supplementary Information on Applications' document, previously circulated.

An objector to the application addressed the Committee.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

A Ward Councillor addressed the Committee in objection to the application.

The Planning Officer advised the Committee that in response to the objections raised regarding overdevelopment it was necessary to show significant harm the development would cause. The size of the development had been reduced and the properties would have larger gardens with tree planting and eight parking spaces.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment on the application.

Members referred to the site visit and opportunity to view the application site and in doing so supported the application, in view of the changes made by the applicant following consultation with planning officers.

Councillor Y Dar made a request to move 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 and the Late Representations submitted.

**PH/20/53 125871/LL/2020 - 42 - 46 Thomas Street (including 41-45 Back Turner Street) Manchester M4 1ER - Piccadilly Ward**

This application relates 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.

At its meeting on 27 August 2020 the Committee resolved that it was 'minded to refuse' this application on the basis that the demolition would be contrary to policies on the conservation of historic assets in the city which represent Manchester's working class heritage. They requested officers to bring a report to the next meeting to address their concerns.

Officers believe that the case setting out why these buildings cannot be retained was clearly set out in the previous report and on that basis they do not believe that a reason for refusal can be substantiated. However, there are policies that seek to protect the historic environment and if Members remain sufficiently concerned about the validity of the case to support the demolition the following reason for refusal is suggested:

The demolition of 42-46 Thomas Street would fail to preserve or enhance the Grade II designated heritage asset causing irreversible harm through the total loss of the buildings which would not meet the tests set out in section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) as a clear and convincing justification for the loss has not been provided and it has not been demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. It is therefore considered to be contrary to Government Guidance contained in Sections 16(2) of (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and The Core Strategy for the City of Manchester, in particular Policy EN3 (Heritage) CC9 (Design and Heritage) and saved policy DC19.1 (Listed Buildings) of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

Notwithstanding the suggested reason for refusal, for the reasons set out in the remainder of the report, the recommendation of officers is that this application be approved subject referral to the Secretary of State in accordance with the Arrangements for handling heritage applications – notification to Historic England and National Amenity Societies and the Secretary of State (England) Direction 2015

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to introduce the report. The Committee was advised that the recommendation of planning officers was that the application should be approved, however if it was the Committee's decision to refuse the application the report provided reasons to support the decision.

No objector attended the meeting.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

A ward councillor addressed the Committee in objection to the application.

The Planning Officer responded to the issues raised and stated that the buildings were currently in a poor state of repair and it was unlikely that sufficient funds would be available to rescue the buildings and further decline was inevitable. In the current state the buildings had no commercial value.

The invited the Committee to comment on the application.

Members in commenting on the application referred to the heritage value of the buildings and the historical importance they hold in terms of Manchester's textile history. It was considered that the historic value of the building outweighed the value provided by the development and for that reason the application should be refused.

Councillor White made a request to move refuse and this was seconded by Councillor J Hitchen.

### **Decision**

Refuse - the demolition of 42-46 Thomas Street would fail to preserve or enhance the Grade II designated heritage asset causing irreversible harm through the total loss of the buildings which would not meet the tests set out in section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) as a clear and convincing justification for the loss has not been provided and it has not been demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. It is therefore considered to be contrary to Government Guidance contained in Sections 16(2) of (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and The Core Strategy for the City of Manchester, in particular Policy EN3 (Heritage) CC9 (Design and Heritage) and saved policy DC19.1 (Listed Buildings) of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

### **PH/20/54 125655/FO/2019 - Water Street Manchester M3 4JQ - Deansgate Ward**

Consideration of this application was deferred at Committee on 27 August 2020.

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 to address these concerns.

The site, known as T1, is 0.32 ha 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.

This application 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 180 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.

Planning Permission has previously been granted for the demolition of all buildings and structures and the erection of a 32 storey residential building comprising 350 homes (Class C3) with retail uses at ground floor (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4); an 8 storey mixed use building comprising workspace (B1), with retail uses (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4) and residential live/work uses; and, the creation of new public realm, landscaping, car and cycle parking, access and other associated works.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to introduce the application.

No objector was present at the meeting.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment on the application.

Members of the Committee referred to the issues previously raised by the Committee regarding the scale of the development and the untested concept of co-living in Manchester and the space provided. Reference was also made to the provision of disabled parking and the necessity of ensuring provision is available for residents and visitors without charging at a prohibited level.

The Planning Officer noted the comments made and explained that the units within the development that could be permanent homes do meet space standards. Issues relating to additional parking would be included in the S106 agreement and conditions attached to the approval notice to the applicant.

Councillor S Ali made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor N Ali.

## **Decision**

Approve subject to:

- a s.106 covering occupancy, long-term management, payment of Council Tax, reduced rental provision and waste management.
- Inclusion in the s106 agreement of 35 disabled parking spaces for residents and visitors that are not charged at a prohibited level.

(Councillor Monaghan did not take part in the consideration of the application.)

**PH/20/55      125573/FO/2019 - Plot 11 First Street 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 relates to 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.

Plot 11 First Street 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

At its meeting on 27 August 2020 the Committee resolved that it was 'minded to refuse' the application on the grounds of the impact on neighbouring residential areas in Hulme and the development is in conflict with policies on current space standard and previous reports from the Executive. They requested officers to bring a report to the next meeting to address these concerns.

The site is an integral part of First Street and is clearly within the City Centre. It is part of a broad sweep of land to the north of the Mancunian Way which has been identified for high density development for over 20 years and includes Great Jackson Street, First Street, Circle Square, UMIST/IQ/ID and Mayfield. It is one of the few remaining areas in the City where the Councils commercial and growth ambitions can be delivered. The committee has previously approved schemes within these areas of a similar overall density and what is proposed here is not unusual.

The southern boundary of the site is adjacent to the Mancunian Way which is an interface with Hulme, This stretch of the Mancunian way is 18m in width and includes an elevated section which clearly separates this part of the City Centre from Hulme. The closest part of the development to any residential property in Hulme is 67m. The impacts of the scheme in terms of amenity are clearly set out in the main body of the report and these are all considered to be acceptable. On this basis officers do not believe that a reason for refusal on these grounds could be substantiated.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to introduce the application.

The Planning Officer made reference to economic information contained within the application which provided an outline of potential benefits of the proposal for:

- employment creation of direct and in direct jobs and apprenticeships;
- inclusion of a local labour agreement;
- the overall benefit the city economy and workforce.

There was no objector present at the meeting.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment on the application.

A member referred to size standards of the studio accommodation which had been considered as unacceptable by the Committee. The point was made that during the Committee's site visit it was noted that the residents of Hulme had a view of the

Mancunian Way and this was not shielded in any way. Officers were asked if an agreement could include help with landscaping to improve the view and reduce road noise for Hulme residents.

The Planning Officer explained that the planning response to issues raised on the space standards of the development had not changed. In response to the point raised on the impact of the development on residents of Hulme it was reported this was not mitigation to support refusal of the application.

Members of the Committee raised a concern that applications that have been previously agreed could result in a new altered application which could make refusing difficult for the Committee. The point was made that co-living could result in residents paying more and living in smaller substandard accommodation. Officers were reminded that the Executive report on co-living had recommended caution in the development of proposals and this should be observed in consideration of the application.

The Planning Officer reported that there is no incentive for people to stay in smaller space accommodation for the reason that it is more expensive. The Council's Executive had agreed to use three locations to test the concept of co-living. The Committee was asked to note the development will help to provide choice of different styles of accommodation to meet demand and the management of the development when completed will be of a very high standard. The Committee was advised that the three locations identified for co-living developments were St John's, Piccadilly/ Northern Quarter and the Southern Corridor. The developments proposed would provide around four thousand five hundred units and it was not proposed to bring further developments of this scale at this time. A cautious approach had been taken with the size and scale of the developments as recommended by the Council's Executive. It was projected that users of the short term tenancy arrangement would vary in length and would provide an alternative to staying in an aparthotel.

A member indicated that they would oppose the application for the reasons that the scale and massing of the development would have a detrimental impact on listed building within the vicinity and loss of amenity for Hulme residents.

The Planning Officer stated that the assessment of the impact of the development of listed buildings had been provided in the planning report and was less than the impact of the previously agreed application for the site. On that basis there were no policy based reason to refuse the application.

A member referred to disabled parking arrangements and proposed that an additional forty four spaces be made available for disabled residents and visitors either on site or off site and that this be included in the s106 agreement.

The recommendation for approval of the application subject to the inclusion of forty four additional disabled parking spaces for residents and visitors either on site or off site to be included in the s106 agreement was proposed by Councillor Flanagan and seconded by Councillor S Ali.

## **Decision**



Minded to approve, subject to a legal agreement in respect of the Heads of Term and the inclusion of forty four additional disabled parking spaces for residents and visitors, either on site or off site, to be included in the s106 agreement.

(Councillors N Ali and Monaghan did not take part in the consideration of the application.)