

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 17 February 2022

Present: Councillor Curley (Chair)

Councillors: Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Riasat, Richards and Stogia

Apologies: Councillors Shaukat Ali, Baker-Smith and Kirkpatrick

Also present:
Councillor Hitchens

PH/22/07 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 132429/FO/2021 and 131895/JO/2021.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/22/08 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2022 as a correct record.

PH/22/09 129318/FO/2021 - Development Adjacent The Jolly Butcher Public House, Petersfield Drive, Manchester, M23 9PS - Brooklands Ward

The applicant was proposing to erect a two storey dwellinghouse on a cul-de-sac off Petersfield Drive. The site is adopted highway and currently allows access to a number of properties on Petersfield Drive and Virginia Close.

This application related to a site, 350m² in size, located on the southern side of Petersfield Drive. The site consists of a small cul-de-sac and associated pavements which provides pedestrian and vehicular access to the rear of nos. 64 and 66 Petersfield Drive, as well as pedestrian access to nos. 14 to 18 Virginia Close and the adjoining pub, The Jolly Butcher. The site is an adopted highway. To the north of the site, on the opposite side of Petersfield Drive, there is a single storey commercial terrace, while to the east there is a terrace of three 2 storey dwellinghouses, nos. 62 to 66 Petersfield Drive. To the east of the site stands The Jolly Butcher PH and to the south lies the rear gardens of nos. 14 to 18 Virginia Close.

The applicant was proposing to erect a two storey detached dwellinghouse on the cul de-sac with gardens to the front and rear, with the rear garden being separated

from the dwelling by a two metre wide strip in order to provide two parking spaces and to allow vehicular access to no. 64 and 66 Petersfield Road.

Objections had been received from five households and the adjoining public house. Objections had been raised in respect of the impact on residential amenity, pedestrian and highway safety and the operation of The Jolly Butcher PH.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that there had been an appeal against non-determination in relation to this application and stated that reasons for the Officer's recommendation of Minded to Refuse were included within the report.

No objector to the application attended the meeting or addressed the Committee on the application.

No Applicant attended the meeting or addressed the Committee on the application.

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

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation of Minded to Refuse for the application. Councillor Stogia seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the recommendation of Minded to Refuse for the reasons outlined within the report.

(Councillors Davies and Kamal were not present for this item and took no part in the discussion or decision making process).

PH/22/10 132429/FO/2021 - Two Parcels Of Land Known As "Trinity Islands" Bounded By The River Irwell, Regent Road, Water Street, Trinity Way And The Railway Manchester M3 4JW - Deansgate Ward

This application was proposing the erection of four towers ranging from 39, 48, 55 and 60 storeys to form a mixed use development comprising 1950 residential apartments (Use Class C3a) and commercial uses (Use Classes E and Sui Generis: Drinking Establishment) (361 sqm) within the podium level together with public realm, car and cycle parking, access arrangements and highway works, and other associated works.

This 1.78 hectare site, currently bounded by the River Irwell, Liverpool Road, Water Street and Regent Road, comprises large areas of hard standing which have been used for parking and recently as a construction compound for the Orsdall Chord. Trinity Way divides the site into two parcels of land know as site C and site D and are connected via an underpass.

There had been eight objections, two neutral comments and one in support.

The Planning officer had no further information or additional comments to make.

No objectors to the application attended the meeting or addressed the Committee on the application.

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

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

A member stated that they noted that this application was a flagship regeneration project but felt there was a judgement call between the amount invested in public realm and the social infrastructure contribution whilst being disappointed in the lack of affordable housing for a scheme of such size and questioned how a reasonable balance can be struck with this type of scheme.

The Planning Officer stated that there were serious challenges for the developer on this site with it being dominated by transport links and within the vicinity of an industrial area. The Planning Officer expressed that this development would have to be desirable in order to work due to these factors or risk failure, adding that lowering the specifications would devalue the scheme. The Planning Officer felt that this site would be an asset to the city with a large amount handed over for public space. £1.5million had been secured to contribute to the creation of a new school and create large job increases. The Planning Officer concluded by stating that further input for affordable housing may be possible due to the 9 year period of development and the potential for costs and values to alter during this timespan.

A member questioned whether the £1.5million towards the school fund was coming from this development alone and also asked if the public space was large enough.

The Planning Officer stated that the creation of the school shell was funded by another development and that the fit out for the school would be covered by the contribution from this application. The Planning Officer confirmed that the public realm was of considerable size, at 40% the size of the Mayfield site.

A member asked about the disposal of food waste.

The Planning Officer confirmed that tenants would be responsible for taking food waste to the ground level.

A member stated that they were disappointed in the lack of affordable housing on site, adding that the school project was also not planned to be on site.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the school would be located at Crown Street.

A member wished to express that there was no bar on affordable housing at any site across the city, including the city centre.

The Chair confirmed this policy.

Councillor Flanagan welcomed this investment and felt that the public space would be a benefit to the city and moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve for the application. Councillor Richards seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to the conditions and the signing of a s106 agreement as detailed in the report.

(Councillor Kamal was not present for this item and took no part in the discussion or decision making process).

PH/22/11 131895/JO/2021 - Coleshill Street Manchester M40 8HH – Miles Platting and Newton Heath Ward

This application was placed before the Committee on 18 January 2022, but committee members agreed to defer determination of the application until the next meeting to allow members to be satisfied that the delivery of affordable dwellings at the site forms part of the development agreement.

Permission was sought to remove condition no.44 attached to planning permission reference 125596/FO/2019 (approved subject to conditions and a section 106 agreement on 10 November 2020), in relation to affordable housing.

The approved scheme for 410 new homes, was accompanied by an Affordable Housing Statement, which outlined that the viability of the scheme had been considered in line with best practice and as such a Viability Assessment was submitted for consideration. There are complex ground conditions on the site, which impact on viability, and it was demonstrated that, in itself, the development could not support affordable housing. Through the involvement of a Registered Provider, however, 114 affordable dwellings are to be provided on the site through grant funding from Homes England.

Since the granting of the planning permission, Homes England has confirmed that the houses would not qualify for funding if they are subject to a planning condition. In this instance the affordable homes would be delivered and secured via the Development Agreement with the City Council and provisions in the leases (fulfilled by virtue of the City Council's landownership interest), rather than by way of condition no.44.

Information was now included within the report to address the concerns of members.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this application had been deferred to allow the Committee to be satisfied that the delivery of affordable housing is controlled via the development agreement. The latest report included a response from the head of development, confirming that the delivery of affordable housing is covered by the development agreement and the late representation detailed that the number and percentage of affordable housing is the same as would have been provided under the original application.

A Local Ward Councillor confirmed that all 3 Ward Councillors were now satisfied with this application.

Councillor Andrews thanked the Planning Officers for fulfilling their obligation in bringing the necessary information back to the Committee and moved the recommendation of Minded to Approve for the application. Councillor Stogia seconded the proposal.

(Councillors Flanagan and Richards both declared an interest in this item and left the room during the consideration of the application).

Decision

The Committee agreed the recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to the conditions and the signing of a s106 agreement as detailed in the report.