Manchester City Council
Report for Resolution

Report to: Executive - 19 October 2016

Subject: Piccadilly Basin Strategic Regeneration Framework

Report of: The Chief Executive

Summary

This report informs the Executive of the outcome of a public consultation exercise with local residents and businesses on the draft Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) for the Piccadilly Basin area; to respond to issues raised; and seek the Executive’s approval and endorsement of the revised Piccadilly Basin SRF.

Recommendations

The Executive is recommended to:

i. Note the comments received on the regeneration strategy and the response to these comments;

ii. Agree the proposed amendments to the Strategic Regeneration Framework arising from the comments received; and

iii. Formally endorse the principles in the revised Piccadilly Basin Strategic Regeneration Framework and request that Planning and Highways Committee take the framework into account as a material consideration when considering planning applications in the Piccadilly Basin area.

Wards Affected:

City Centre
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manchester Strategy outcomes</th>
<th>Summary of the contribution to the strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities</td>
<td>The framework will provide the catalyst for further investment within both the area and the wider city centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The regeneration framework will see the creation of a residential and commercial destination utilising the potential of Piccadilly Basin. The delivery of this will provide a range of new employment opportunities within the city centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The framework sets the objective of delivering a distinctive location which will support the continued growth of the city’s economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A highly skilled city: world class and home grown talent sustaining the city’s economic success</td>
<td>The SRF will see the creation of a number of new jobs across a range of sectors within Piccadilly Basin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The expanded retail and leisure offer in addition to the creation of new commercial space will both attract new organisations to the city and facilitate the expansion of existing Manchester based businesses. This will in turn see the creation of a number of new jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The framework will provide additional homes within close proximity to both the job opportunities created, not only within the Basin but also to key emerging city centre neighbourhoods including New Islington, the Northern Quarter and Great Ancoats Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities</td>
<td>The regeneration framework complements development at adjacent neighbourhoods including the wider Piccadilly area, New Islington, Northern Quarter and Great Ancoats Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The SRF will deliver desirable residential development at the heart of the city centre, providing residents with access to key retail and leisure amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A unique leisure offer will contribute towards creating a city centre neighbourhood of choice. The framework will deliver this through utilising the potential capacity of the Piccadilly Basin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work

The area benefits from excellent public transport connectivity, ensuring the site can be accessed by visitors, residents and commuters without a reliance on car usage.

Sustainable design and development principles will be tested at planning application stage.

A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth

The Piccadilly Basin area will benefit from strong public transport links with both rail and Metrolink stations within the vicinity, in addition to access to the bus network.

The development framework prioritises pedestrian walkways and improved pedestrian connectivity, which will provide residents with better linkages to surrounding neighbourhoods and city centre districts. New public spaces and connections are proposed, which will significantly improve the environment of this part of the city centre.

Full details are in the body of the report, along with any implications for:

- Equal Opportunities Policy
- Risk Management
- Legal Considerations

Financial Consequences – Revenue

Financial Consequences – Capital

Contact Officers:

Name: Sir Howard Bernstein  
Position: Chief Executive  
Telephone: 0161 234 3006  
E-mail: h.bernstein@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Dave Roscoe  
Position: Planning Development  
Telephone: 0161 234 4567  
E-mail: d.roscoe@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Pat Bartoli  
Position: Head: City Centre Growth & Regeneration  
Telephone: 0161 234 3329  
E-mail: p.bartoli@manchester.gov.uk
Background documents (available for public inspection):

The following documents disclose important facts on which the report is based and have been relied upon in preparing the report. Copies of the background documents are available up to 4 years after the date of the meeting. If you would like a copy please contact one of the contact officers above.

- HS2 Manchester Piccadilly Strategic Regeneration Framework (2014)
- Draft Piccadilly Basin Strategic Regeneration Framework - May 2016
- Report to Executive – Piccadilly Basin Strategic Regeneration Framework – 1 June 2016

All held in Room 303, Town Hall
1.0 Introduction

1.1 On 1 June 2016, the Executive endorsed, in principle, a Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) for the Piccadilly Basin area, and requested that the Chief Executive undertake a public consultation exercise in relation to it.

1.2 This report summarises the outcome of the public consultation on the Piccadilly Basin SRF and sets outs the responses to the comments made.

2.0 The Consultation Process

2.1 Consultation letters have been sent out to 3,276 local residents and businesses, informing them about the public consultation, how to engage in the consultation process, and where to access the Framework document. The Piccadilly Basin SRF was made available on the Council’s website, and comments were invited on this.

2.2 The formal consultation closed on 19 August 2016.

3.0 Responses

3.1 In total 65 responses were received in response to the consultation letters, broken down as follows:

- 58 from residents, individuals and residents groups
- 2 from stakeholder organisations
- 2 from statutory/public organisations
- 1 from City Centre Ward Councillors
- 1 from the Friends of the Northern Quarter grow boxes
- 1 from an interest group

3.2 Consultation comments

In response to the consultation a range issues were raised by respondents. These are all within the following categories:

- Building heights and density
- Public realm and greening
- Vehicle parking and multi-storey car park
- Design and heritage
- Safety, crime and anti social behaviour
- Waterways
- The consultation process
- Definition of the Piccadilly Basin Area
- Housing
- Public transport, cycling and pedestrian use
- The Strategic Regeneration framework document
- Economic context
- Families, communities and wellbeing
Additional comments

The City Centre Ward Councillors consultation response welcomed the creation of the Strategic Regeneration Framework stating that the regeneration proposals would transform the Piccadilly Basin into a vibrant, safe and attractive community. The response also raises a number of concerns for consideration which are illustrated below.

Additionally both the Friends of the Northern Quarter grow Boxes and a local residents group welcome in principle the proposal to regenerate the area. Both felt the area holds potential to contribute towards a sustainable community. Both respondents raise a number of concerns for consideration which are also illustrated below:

Building heights & density

3.2 A number of responses from individuals, Councillors and the interest group stated that the proposed heights illustrated are much taller than the existing buildings and there were concerns that the development will not be in keeping with the typology of the surrounding listed buildings.

3.3 A number of responses from respondents stated that they felt the building heights and density will create a loss of amenities for residents including: rights to light; a loss of views; and a loss of privacy through over exposure, all of which the respondents commented would affect the quality of life of current residents. Specific comments were made on the buildings marked P and N within the SRF in relation to a loss of light at Vantage Quay, Millington House and The Met.

3.4 A response stated that commercial office development appears to be overly dense with no adjacent public space. The respondent added they would like to see the building marked as P within the SRF altered to become a public square. An additional comment added the density of the development will have a serious impact on the Piccadilly Basin area.

3.5 There was an acknowledgement from a number of respondents that the existing surface level car parking was economically and environmentally not the best use of space. However the respondents added that serious consideration should be given to building heights and development density, commenting that height should be restricted and there should be the creation of shared space between the buildings, preferably containing green space.

3.6 A respondent welcomed the design of Burlington House, however commented that they felt the proposal too tall for the site.

3.7 It was requested that the building marked as H within the SRF should incorporate ground floor retail / leisure space fronting Tariff Street.
3.8 It was suggested that the buildings marked as Q and R within the Framework were not ambitious enough in relation to heights. Adding two taller glass towers would provide an impressive entrance to the Basin.

3.9 The Councillors’ response recommended that development within view of the historic buildings in the SRF area is restricted to ground floor plus 6 storeys in height. Specific reference is given to the building marked as ‘L’ within the SRF, stating previous planning guidance around the Dale Street car park area has ensured developments have remained in line with the height of Carvers Warehouse and surrounding buildings. It is added that residents and building owners have been previously informed that development within the area would be kept to the aforementioned height.

3.10 The interest group response requests an assessment of predicted population density within the SRF area.

3.11 The interest group commented that the area cannot house a mixed use development due to its size and instead should be developed as a residential neighbourhood.

3.12 The interest group requests the active involvement of heritage groups in the consideration of the impact of massing.

**Public Realm & Greening**

3.13 A large number of the responses from residents alongside the Councillors, Friends of Northern Quarter grow boxes and interest group were concerned about the loss of the grow boxes. Currently situated within the SRF area, the grow boxes have been implemented and maintained by the local community and have received a number of RHS City in Bloom awards. A number of comments referenced that no mention is made within the framework for the re-siting / re-provision of the grow boxes, and state that losing these would impact on the area’s collective community in addition to the health and wellbeing of residents. The respondents request that the grow boxes are retained or transferred within the SRF and integrated positively in to the design and public realm of the newly regenerated site.

3.14 Three responses questioned the lack of ‘green roofs’ and requested this is reconsidered as part of the SRF. One of these comments requested that any roof garden provision should be accessible to the public adding that there could be scope for those maintaining the NQ grow boxes to maintain the green roof gardens.

3.15 A number of respondents commented strongly that the SRF lacks provision of green space. The comments expanded on this point adding both the Northern Quarter and also the wider city centre need further green space. One comment added that specific recommendations on the percentage dedicated to sustainable public realm within the SRF area should be stipulated by the City Council.
3.16 It was suggested that the development is an opportunity for two new ‘green squares’.

3.17 A respondent asked that all public realm within the area should be genuinely public, and involve the community through existing networks, new groups and the school at New Islington in the planning and management.

3.18 A further respondent suggested that tree lined streets should be incorporated within the SRF.

3.19 Three responses requested the area be considered as a city centre park, with one respondent stating this should be prioritised over other forms of public realm. A second commented that this is the last location within the city centre with capacity to provide a park. A separate response stated that it could incorporate a children’s play area.

3.20 A respondent stated that they felt green space should not be delivered in the form of a park due to safety concerns.

3.21 The response from Councillors welcomes the priorities set out in 3.43 and 5.36 to create new green spaces and place public space at the heart of Piccadilly Basin’s place-making strategy.

3.22 Responses from a residents group and also an interest group stated that the area within the SRF designated for buildings M – R, should instead be utilized as green space and public realm.

3.23 The Friends of the Northern Quarter grow boxes stated that the Council should make recommendations on the percentage of SRF area given to sustainable public realm, adding that this space should be genuinely publicly accessible.

3.24 The friends group stated that they believe the design and management of new public realm should be community led, utilizing new and existing groups, including the school at New Islington.

**Vehicle parking and multi-storey car park**

3.25 A number of comments from individual respondents, Councillors, the friends group and interest group raised issues relating to vehicle parking and the construction of a multi-storey vehicle parking facility. Comments received stated that the inclusion of the car park could be seen to conflict with the city’s strategy of encouraging public transport and developing a ‘liveable low carbon city’ and would increase both traffic and pollution and reduce air quality.

3.26 Two respondents questioned the need for a multi-storey car park within the SRF. With a number of respondents referencing the opinion that a multi-storey car park would significantly increase congestion within the area. Two respondents specified the location proposed would make it difficult to access and leave the residents car parks at peak times.
3.27 Two comments received stated that the area’s roads are narrow and in deteriorating condition making them unsuitable for increasing the volume of traffic. One of the respondents added that at weekends the roads almost become pedestrianised which raised further concern in relation to vehicular traffic as the roads become areas with a high volume of pedestrians.

3.28 One response stated additional commercial, leisure or residential space would be more suitable while another and the friends group stated that the current surface car parks are never at capacity, which negates the need for a new car parking facility.

3.29 Two individual responses, Councillors and the interest group response requested that the Council and development partners provide underground parking rather than a multi-storey facility.

3.30 A number of responses commented on the visual impact of a multi-storey car park stating the design will have a detrimental effect on the surrounding historic buildings and the height will overshadow Vantage Quay.

3.31 A respondent stated the MSCP proposed should be located within Ancoats rather than the Piccadilly Basin area to reduce the impact on the city centre. The ward Councillors also stated that they would like to see a strategy of locating car parks (particularly multi-storey facilities) on the outskirts of the city centre to minimise the number of vehicles within it. This response requests that a full traffic assessment of the area is undertaken. The interest group response adds a request for a thorough assessment of parking need both within the SRF area and the wider city centre.

3.32 The interest group state their opposition to the inclusion of a multi-storey car park within the SRF area. The response states that the 2007 masterplan for the area did not contain a car park yet the 2016 SRF has a car park proposed.

**Design and heritage**

3.33 A number of responses raised the issue of design sensitivity, stating that new buildings should complement the heritage and character of the area and surrounding listed buildings. These responses request the use of high quality materials. Two of the respondents added that the materials illustrated within the SRF are not in keeping with the heritage features of the area. The response from the Ward Councillors also states the importance of appropriate design and the use of heritage-led materials.

3.34 The interest group response concurs with the Strategic Regeneration Framework’s acknowledgement of the exceptional character within the Piccadilly Basin area, and the group agree that the area requires change to transform it into a well designed, managed safe and accessible neighbourhood.
Three further responses state the proposals are not in keeping with the surrounding heritage or character of the Northern Quarter’s independent heritage.

A single respondent stated that the residential development should allow the free movement and flow of pedestrians through the SRF area.

A comment received stated the development is an opportunity to achieve consistency across the area in paving, lighting and street furniture.

Two responses raised noise pollution as a concern, stating that active ground floor uses would create noise pollution that would be exacerbated by the listed residential dwellings having single glazed windows.

Three responses specified that they felt the proposed development isn’t in keeping with the neighbourhood. One respondent commented that the commercial buildings clash with the alternative nature of the Northern Quarter.

A respondent felt that no consideration had been given to the position of the buildings marked K and L within the SRF. Switching the buildings would create an aesthetically pleasing gradient towards the centre of the Basin.

A response commented the majority of the buildings within the SRF area are listed, and felt it was unfair that current residents cannot make any exterior alterations to buildings however development at the scale proposed can happen adjacent to their buildings.

A single response enquired about provision of improved drainage as it is felt further development within the area will affect the water balance and could potentially lead to flooding.

The response from the interest group comments that the Grade II entrance archway to the Rochdale Canal is a significant feature and heritage asset. It is the view of the group that the SRF proposals will further detract from it. The group felt that the development should seek to restore the historic Rochdale Canal archway’s role as a legible entrance.

TfGM stated that they are supportive of the Framework, commenting that the proposals should ensure the inclusion of: active frontages at ground level; enhanced permeability; the promotion of public transport; and cycling and walking as modes of transport.

Safety, crime and anti social behaviour

Comments stated that the area should be well lit and regular patrols should form the basis of a management plan developed for the area, to ensure it doesn’t become a no go zone.

A comment suggests the avoidance of an open park within the area, so as not to encourage its use for crime and anti social behaviour.
3.47 A number of the respondents stated that they are concerned that the building densities and heights will create more dark spaces and promote anti social behaviour within the SRF area.

**Waterways**

3.48 A respondent requested that any development is set back 15 metres from the canal to provide usable public space.

3.49 A single respondent commented that the document should reference the provision of permanent moorings and making the area attractive to boaters.

3.50 Three responses referenced the ecology of the canal, requesting confirmation that there will be no displacement of the wildlife at the canal.

3.51 Two responses stated that the developments connectivity with the canal network is unclear, adding that the framework needs to specify how the development will improve links, and improve the amenity value of the canal network.

3.52 The Councillors’ response comments that Town Centre Securities have already made improvements to Rochdale Canal and introduced a new Marina at the heart of the Basin. The regeneration of Piccadilly Basin can capitalise on these assets by continuing to improve and add to the public realm and creating a highly desirable, distinctive and attractive waterside development. The Ward Councillors would like to see the canal sides and moorings further opened up and designed as openly accessible public space with the SRF.

**The consultation process**

3.53 Three responses stated that the consultation process lacked transparency based on the scale of the proposed development. One response added that there was a lack of information received by residents with a second commenting there was insufficient consultation time.

3.54 Two responses relate to the existing community. One respondent stated their disappointment at the Council’s failure to meet with community groups to discuss the proposals, with a second commenting that they have strong concerns that the plan does not take adequate account of the existing community.

3.55 The Ward Councillors felt that the detailed document is not an adequate replacement for the need for community consultation on the SRF. Councillors wish to see residents and businesses brought in during the design process and development. The response requests a strategy outlining how developers plan to approach this within the local community. As part of this strategy it is felt a meeting should be arranged between Friends of Northern Quarter grow boxes, officers and the developer.
Definition of the area of Piccadilly Basin

3.56 Relating to Figure 4.2 within the SRF, the City Centre Councillors recommend the area defined as the Piccadilly Basin incorporates the entire Piccadilly canal basin area. It is suggested the SRF includes residents and businesses within buildings: Jutland House/Junction works, The Place, Navigation House, Paradise Wharf and Piccadilly Village due to the impact of the development both during and post delivery.

Housing

3.57 The Councillors’ response acknowledges point 3.37 within the SRF and states it should be ensured that the policy on affordable housing is adhered to. The interest group response requests a clearer indication on how the affordable housing policy will be implemented within the SRF area.

3.58 Based on the City’s priorities for growth (point 3.43 - Priority 4:) the Ward Councillors stated a desire to see an adequate number of 3 bedroom properties provided under this priority.

Public transport, cycling & pedestrian use

3.59 The response from Transport for Greater Manchester commented that the SRF represents a positive approach to an area with excellent public transport links however that it makes a limited contribution to the local economy in its current form.

3.60 The response from the interest group states that whilst the SRF references cycling throughout, it fails to recognise the surface conditions within the area or how cyclists might be separated from other traffic following the development.

3.61 The interest group request the active involvement of cycling groups to ensure a credible outcome for the framework.

3.62 The interest group response commented that the SRF does not include proposals that promote public access / permeability beyond what pedestrians can already do.

3.63 The interest group state that the development of a multi-storey cart park will increase traffic on the smaller streets and oppose the creation of coherent and safe pedestrian routes.

3.64 The interest group feel sections 4.90 to 4.114 are an extensive and overwritten listing of transport links. It is expressed that despite this, the SRF contains nothing that enhances or promotes the use of public transport.

The Strategic Regeneration Framework document
3.65 The interest group state that figure 4.5 within the SRF document is incorrectly annotated. Adding that the numbers are placed wrongly on the diagram which creates confusion about the intentions of the 1998 masterplan for the general public.

3.66 Figure 4.7 is stated to be incorrect. The response comments that the triangular area on the Ducie Street side which is white is also used as surface parking. The diagram omits the presence of Sixt Rent a Car on the Ducie Street side land.

3.67 A response requests that the location of the Northern Quarter grow boxes in figure 4.7 (currently marked as white), is amended to mark the community asset.

3.68 It is commented that Figure 4.12 refers to 13 key views, but only 12 are listed in the view description. The respondent adds that ‘view 13’ is a significant omission.

3.69 The interest group commented that the SRF sits uneasily between being a policy document, a planning guide and information for public consultation. Adding that whilst the Executive Summary does summarise the contents, it does not fulfil the usual function which is to make clear the key intentions and recommendations. The group feel that duplicating Figures 5.2 and 5.7 at the beginning of the document will provide clarity on the location and number of buildings proposed.

3.70 The group expressed the opinion that it cannot be said that Belgravia Living Group are a delivery partner with a proven track record, adding that the perception of Belgravia within the area is not a positive one and addressing this must be part of any delivery strategy.

**Economic context**

3.71 Citing economic uncertainty post Brexit the interest group feel it is not suitable to develop buildings M to R as commercial property. The response also questions the ability to secure a high quality 4/5 star hotel operator.

3.72 The response from the interest group advises that the Council wait for 6 months post Brexit before undertaking a revision of the economic context.

3.73 TfGM believe the SRF supports the objectives set out in the Piccadilly HS2 SRF.

**Families, Communities and Well-being**

3.74 The interest group state that the SRF should reflect the aspiration for a neighbourhood that places an emphasis on family-orientated activity. The response adds that it is felt the proposed development does not provide a hospitable context for child development with poor access to child education, will make the area undesirable for parents.
3.75 The interest group comment that the SRF should give consideration to mental health impacts, prioritising the creation of spaces that reduce stress and isolation and encourages interaction and a sense of community.

Additional comments

The remainder of the responses received were of a more general nature. These include;

3.76 The billboards for "Pure Gym" etc. should be removed from Dale Street to improve visibility within the area.

3.77 A single respondent stated that the surface quality of Tariff Street is poor and there are no clear road markings, for almost the entire length. The respondent added that the only place for turning a vehicle within the area at present is the surface car parks. Removing these and increasing vehicle activity as part of any development would increase safety issues within the SRF area.

3.78 A respondent commented clearer road markings and signage is required on Port Street, adding that there is insufficient resident parking provision and that new development should seek to provide additional capacity.

3.79 A respondent criticised the proposed delivery timescales for the area, stating they would like to see it built more quickly. A second response stated that each phase should be completed in its entirety before a new one commences, in order to minimise the risk of stalled development.

3.80 Two responses questioned the need for new commercial office buildings, with one respondent asking if studies had been undertaken on demand for office space and vehicle parking. A second respondent suggested that the City Council should look at empty factories and encourage the development of these sites.

3.81 A response commented that cycling provision is essential and that this provision should include cycle routes/accessibility in addition to secure storage facilities.

3.82 A respondent stated their disappointment to see no provision for any live music/comedy/theatre venues.

3.83 Two responses cited the area’s use within the filming and production industry. These comments stated that the development proposed will mean the area cannot be used for filming as it has been historically.

3.84 A respondent commented that there is no definitive boundary of “The Basin”, adding that the SRF contains inaccurate information, as some of the buildings mentioned have been demolished, without stipulating which.
3.85 A respondent stated that Great Ancoats Retail Park is an eyesore for the area and development of the site should be brought forward.

3.86 A response asked what thought had been given to preserve archaeological findings / fabric discovered as part of the construction process.

4.0 Stakeholder Comments

In response to the consultation we received two stakeholder responses from Zerum, who represent an adjacent landowner and Evans Property Group.

4.1 Zerum outlined their support for the SRF and its mix of uses, commenting that the document was reflective of demand trends.

4.2 However, it was felt that the SRF should make stronger reference to the existence of other land owners in addition to Belgravia Living.

4.3 The response commented that figures 4.7 & 4.8 within the SRF should be updated to reflect their current state. The site and adjoining land has now been largely cleared and not in use as ‘commercial’ which has been indicated. In addition the illustrated massing of between 1 and 5 storeys requires amendment as the bulk of this land now sits at grade.

4.4 Zerum comment that the Store Street development scheme details on page 43 of the SRF should be amended. Stating that this scheme has been considered and approved by the Councils planning committee for a 30 storey building not 15 storeys as referenced within the SRF.

4.5 The response stated that there has been a swap agreement between Zerum and Belgravia Living, within the SRF area.

4.6 Zerum acknowledge that the SRF doesn’t seek to provide a definitive form of development, however have requested that the indicative proposals concerning the height and total GEA of buildings E & F are amended within the SRF.

4.7 Zerum state that they don’t feel a pedestrian route between blocks E & F is appropriate.

4.8 They also commented that the SRF provides a written overview of phases 1-5 with their clients development listed as the final phase, ‘phase 6’. The response outlines a resistance to a phasing strategy that prioritises the development brought forward by other land owners within the SRF area without any urban design / masterplan justification. Stating that if there is a phase 6, the SRF should further reference what this incorporates.

4.9 Evans Property Group welcomes the regeneration of the area and the SRF which indicates potential for hotel development within the area.

5.0 Historic England comments
5.1 Historic England welcome the principle of re-development of this important historic area which currently is largely fragmented and covered by a number of surface car parks and large commercial buildings. The response adds that sensitive redevelopment in other historic locations, such as Castlefield and Ancoats, has helped to create some of the city’s most cherished and popular environments.

5.2 The response states that there are 8 listed buildings within the area, of which three are grade II* listed (Carvers Warehouse, Jackson’s Warehouse and Brownsfield Mill). It is the impact on these buildings through their setting which primarily concerns Historic England’s response to this SRF. The historical and architectural significance of these buildings is inextricably linked to the creation of the canal, and represent a rare survival in an area which has lost so much of its historic context and is now fragmented.

5.3 Historic England state that detailed comments will be provided as specific planning requests are made, it is felt more appropriate to comment on the potential impact of any development at this stage. Subsequently, early consultation at pre-application stage is welcomed.

5.4 Historic England feel the area’s historic significance lies in its close connection to Manchester’s early industrial development with the construction of the canals and the growth of warehousing, mills and canal wharfs. The response commented that whilst a number of historic buildings were cleared and canal basins in-filled as the area went into decline during the 20C, the main canal, locks and tow path were largely retained.

5.5 They commented that in order to achieve the distinctive redevelopment that the SRF aims to accomplish, conserving and restoring the areas important spatial characteristics, key views and canal setting of listed buildings are imperative. It is suggest that this should be based on an understanding of the historic context, whilst making more active use of the canal corridor.

5.6 Historic England acknowledge the view outlined within the SRF that states, in contrast to the surrounding conservation areas, the Piccadilly Basin area developed on an informal street pattern due to its close connection to the function of the canal. It is felt that this gives an opportunity to separate it from the Northern Quarter and create a different sense of place rather than continuing the grid pattern from the Stephenson Conservation area as indicated and risk losing the special character of the place.

5.7 Historic England agrees with the principle that height could build up fronting Great Ancoats Street. However they add that the visual impact of the indicated height would need to be carefully assessed to establish the impact on surrounding highly designated assets.

5.8 The response comments that the Basin’s open setting to the east is still apparent albeit as an untidy car park, and is an essential part of its historic
significance and one of few places within the area where it is possible to understand the area’s historic context.

5.9 Historic England acknowledges that the document has been supported by heritage advice from experienced heritage consultants.

5.10 Historic England feel the proposed development in the location to the east of Carvers Warehouse would harm the understanding of its historic context. Stating that losing such an opportunity of place-making in combination with the level of harm to the significance of the building, makes it difficult to accept in principle as well as at detailed application stage. While they welcome the historic analysis within the SRF and support many of the principles for re-development, they recommend that further consideration of historic layout is given specifically in character area A and the setting of Carvers Warehouse, but also in general throughout the SRF area to avoid harm and support creative place-making.

6.0 Response to consultation comments

The comments received in response to the consultation from individuals, resident groups, City Centre Ward Councillors, Friends of Northern Quarter grow boxes and an interest group are all addressed within the following categories;

- Building heights and density
- Public realm and greening
- Vehicle parking and multi-storey car park
- Design and heritage
- Safety, crime and anti social behaviour
- Waterways
- The consultation process
- Definition of the Piccadilly Basin Area
- Housing
- Public transport, cycling and pedestrian use
- The Strategic Regeneration framework document
- Economic context
- Families, communities and wellbeing
- Additional comments

Building Heights & Density

6.1 The building heights outlined within the SRF are indicative and will be subject to testing in terms of their relationship to heritage assets, conservation areas as well as sunlight /daylight and overshadowing as part of planning applications. Policy does not state that proximity to a conservation area should result in a prescribed a height in terms of new development. Instead, a careful consideration and weighting of impact versus the wider benefits delivered by a new scheme is required based on a robust understanding of the heritage issues and significance. The SRF has been underpinned by a
6.2 The SRF has been developed within the context of an adopted HS2 masterplan for the area which has informed the scale consideration. The distribution of height has been carefully considered and staggered within the site to take into account heritage and other context considerations.

6.3 A key principle for the masterplan has been to reinstate the urban grain of the area and this has dictated the street pattern and density that is considered. As part of this grain, a varied and significant amount of public space and new legible connections are proposed, with a focus particularly around the area’s key natural and man-made assets. This is an essential part of place making.

6.4 High quality public realm is an integral part of the SRF proposals. The document notes the need to consider carefully the effect of the proposals on existing residential buildings and other sensitive receptors in terms of sunlight and daylight. As phases of development come forward the detailed planning applications will require sunlight and daylight assessments to understand and minimise effects. It should however be pointed out that the density of development that is appropriate within the city centre, and the fundamental principle of respecting and reinstating the urban grain of this area, means that sunlight and daylight effects will be inevitable. This will be as a consequence of any development emphasised by the fact that there is a ‘false baseline’ of cleared sites that are in need of regeneration.

6.5 In relation to the impact of building heights on heritage assets, the SRF proposes staggering the height of new development away from Carvers Warehouse. The suggestion to reposition the proposed multi-storey car park opposite Jacksons Warehouse would place it in a more sensitive location in respect to heritage.

6.6 Whilst the SRF heights and layout are indicative, views of Brownsfield Mill from the Tariff Street, and the Canal Corridor etc. have all been clearly preserved. As mentioned in point 9.3, detailed planning application proposals will need to be accompanied by an extensive analysis of key views and will need to consider the effect of proposals on the setting of the Grade II* Brownsfield Mill.

6.7 The SRF proposals are for a sustainable mixed use, vibrant neighbourhood of choice, which will enhance the quality of life within the area. High quality and sensitive new development as proposed within the framework area will improve the quality of the environment and popularity of this area.

6.8 The economic and market rationale for the development is set out at length within the document. The city centre is the key economic driver and a strategic employment location and presently there is an undersupply of Grade A floorspace. New office development within St Peter’s Square has come forward with the benefit of significant pre-lets to major occupiers. Piccadilly Basin will be delivered over a number of years, as indicated in the phasing
strategy, and as a prime location for offices due to its prime city centre location adjacent to the regional transport hub and the vibrant Northern Quarter, is excellently placed to support Manchester’ growth and future need for additional office space. This commercial growth is also aligned with the delivery of refurbished office space within the city centre.

6.9 All indicative heights have been formulated to take into account relationships with adjoining sites. The indicative Block L proposals respond to the Ducie Street streetscape, including the adjoining commercial office building (BDP) and steps down to the canal.

6.10 The 2007 planning consent and the HS2 Manchester Piccadilly SRF promote a mix of uses on this site and the locational attributes that support commercial development on part of the site have dictated the requirement to retain that significant component.

6.11 The location, adjacent neighbourhoods, accessibility, high quality connections and continued projected growth all suggest that further commercial units within the site can be supported. This may encompass a variety of uses such as retail, restaurant, leisure, workspace etc. and will be dictated as market demand evolves. Where commercial uses are not appropriate, the document identifies the need to activate streets through front doors, windows and other means.

6.12 We are unaware of a planning history that restricts scale to the height of Carvers Warehouse. This would see the underutilisation of a key city centre site and prevent regeneration from happening on viability grounds. Higher density development including buildings that may be taller than adjoining buildings can be appropriate where the design is high quality, contextually responsive and supported by very high quality public realm.

6.13 The HS2 Manchester Piccadilly SRF has already identified the importance of the Piccadilly Basin SRF area as a part of the city centre that can accommodate higher density development if based on the right principles. These principles have been articulated in the SRF and will be tested through the consideration of detailed planning applications. The Tariff Street residential proposals for a 13 storey building are an example of high quality approach to development, clearly in view of the heritage assets, yet supported by Historic England and the Local Planning Authority in securing Planning Permission.

6.14 The 8 storey building on Plot L can therefore be seen as appropriate and consistent with the scale of the adjoining office building. The height relationship with adjoining residential buildings will need to be tested in terms of heritage, key views, amenity through the planning process; however, the developers are confident that an appropriate, high quality design solution can be delivered within that parameter. This plot now has firm interest from a high quality hotel operator which will seek the development of a proposal of circa. 8 storeys on this site.

Public Realm & Greening
6.15 Amendments have been made to the SRF based on responses to the public consultation to maximise green space within the area, and make provision for the Northern Quarter grow boxes. The re-provision of grow boxes has been identified within the final version of the SRF and further dialogue was recommended and is now underway with the Friends of Northern Quarter grow boxes.

6.16 Opportunities for green space have been maximised and further emphasised within the final SRF. It should, however, be noted that connections and routes through the site’s public areas will require robust materials and this is likely to also necessitate areas of hard landscaping as part of a mixed palate.

6.17 Green space and tree planting is indicated as a principle within the SRF. This has been reinforced both in the text and diagrams within the final version of the document.

6.18 High level design principles along with precedent images and text have been provided within the document in relation to public realm. Future planning application proposals will be required to provide landscaping schemes that are high quality and complementary to both the design approach of new building proposals and the wider SRF objectives.

6.19 In response to the comment that states green space should not be delivered in the form of an open park due to safety concerns, it should be noted that the SRF includes a significant amount of public space with safety and security put forward as a key consideration for future development in this regard.

6.20 It should be noted in response to comments stating that the area is the last remaining site able to deliver a park that the Council is working with partners to deliver a major new city centre park as part of the Mayfield regeneration proposals. The Mayfield SRF area is located within easy walking distance of Piccadilly Basin.

6.21 High quality public realm and the importance of future management and maintenance across the SRF are identified within the SRF document as key principles.

6.22 The success and popularity of the city centre can only be supported by high quality new development. This has certainly been the case over the last 20 years demonstrated by the significant progress that has been made in terms of urban regeneration.

6.23 In response to the request for a play area, the uses of this public realm will be discussed as further detailed design is brought forward.

Vehicle parking and multi-storey car park
6.24 The SRF site currently accommodates 817 publicly accessible car parking spaces including 585 surface car parking spaces and 232 spaces within the existing Tariff Street MSCP.

6.25 The SRF identifies an overall reduction in publicly accessible car parking to circa 500 spaces car park. Clearly this is an indicative figure and will be adjusted over time in line with demand. Indeed, should demand recede further than anticipated as a result of enhanced sustainable transport opportunities then the car parking strategy will be reviewed at that time. The emphasis of the SRF is very much on promoting sustainable forms of development both through major investment in public transport and promotion of sustainable travel behaviour as part of new development. Notwithstanding the above, car parking demand will continue and does need to be recognised.

6.26 In relation to the location of the proposed multi-storey car park, the site’s proximity to the inner ring road, mean that the SRF area is ideally located to continue to provide car parking that will support the regeneration of both this site and the wider area. This will assist in addressing the loss of surface car parking spaces for commuters anticipated in the area as regeneration proposals come forward as well as meeting the demand from new development. Alternative locations proposed within the consultation including Ancoats would be too remote from where the car parking demand is and will arise.

6.27 New car parking will also be provided for the proposed development on a plot by plot basis; however, there will be limited opportunities to do this on sites without significantly impairing the ability to create attractive public realm with active frontages. This vehicle parking will be sensitively incorporated into new development so as not to detract from key public routes and spaces.

6.28 The ability to create underground car parking cannot be sustained due to ground conditions, and archaeological constraints. These constraints mean that underground car parking is not viable.

6.29 The new MSCP is likely to ultimately replace the existing MSCP on Tariff Street with a proposal that is better located. This is explained within the SRF to the extent that the existing MSCP is a missed opportunity: “offering no active frontage to Laysall Street, Tariff Street or the canal. Relocating the MSCP to Brewer Street allows the creation of a residential development on Laysall Street / Tariff Street corner, built around a landscaped space open to the canal.”

6.30 The development is unlikely to increase the level of traffic within the area as the total numbers of parking will be decreased, by reducing the number of commuter/short stay spaces available by approximately half in place of longer stay residential spaces. This should reduce the peak hour traffic numbers within the area and the city as it will encourage the displaced personal vehicle commuters to use more sustainable modes of transport such as Metrolink, trains, buses, walking and cycling. These alternative modes of transport will continue to be promoted in line with best practise; however, at the current time
the identification of an MSCP is appropriate in order to accommodate demand from existing and future residents and commuters.

6.31 During detailed design of the multi-storey car park the location of the access and egress will be carefully positioned to ensure that the impacts of traffic entering or leaving the site will be minimal. Such impacts can be further reduced through suitable highway design that reduces traffic speeds, creating the opportunity for courtesy to occur.

6.32 Vehicle parking requirements are detailed within the SRF which accounts for resident parking demand through the proposed on-site parking integrated into new developments and also the potential for a new MSCP.

**Design & heritage**

6.33 In relation to concerns around design quality, we support the view that it is imperative to use high quality and contextually responsive materials in the delivery of the proposal. The SRF emphasises a quality and contextual response to the use of materials throughout.

6.34 Town Centre Securities are a delivery partner, who has a track record of delivering high quality developments within the locality. These including existing development in the area such as Vantage Quay, Carvers Warehouse and Jackson’s Warehouse.

6.35 It is important that as identified within consultation, development improves the lives of communities by providing opportunities to bring people together through the design of buildings and public spaces. Given its importance this principle is addressed within the SRF. Manchester’s draft Residential Quality Guidance will also be an important consideration in the determination of future applications.

6.36 In relation to the development uses, it is important to provide a mixture of uses within the SRF area. Noise pollution will be carefully assessed and controlled as part of the detailed consideration of future planning applications. However the adjoining office uses are not considered to be a significant noise generating, use, so we would expect this to be mitigated.

6.37 The SRF area forms part of the HS2 Manchester Piccadilly SRF and will have a different character to the Northern Quarter. The Northern Quarter will continue to be protected through planning policy in terms of the important ‘alternative’ role that it performs within the city centre.

6.38 All future planning applications will need to provide flood risk and drainage strategies to demonstrate how the matters of water balance will be dealt with. Sustainable Urban Drainage has clearly been identified in the SRF and will be promoted wherever it is possible and appropriate to do so within the constraints of the site.
6.39 The SRF principles have been underpinned by a heritage assessment of the site. This has informed the urban grain and identified connections to the canal as a key principle. Heights and siting of buildings are arranged in response to an appreciation of the character of the area, key views and settings of listed buildings. Materiality will be handled in detail as part of future planning applications; however the SRF does emphasise the importance of high quality and contextually responsive materials and references precedents to further reinforce this point.

6.40 In response to comments on the Grade II listed entrance arch, it is agreed that the development should seek to restore the arch as a legible entrance given the main pedestrian route through this part of the site aligns with the arch. This has been referenced within the revised draft SRF.

6.41 Historic England has provided a response to this consultation and further dialogue will continue as detailed designs are developed.

Safety, crime and anti social behaviour

6.42 Safety and security are identified as important principles in the SRF. New routes and spaces will be activated and natural surveillance promoted. The SRF identifies that new development should adhere to the principles of ‘Secure by Design.’ This will include the appropriate use of lighting and effective management. In addition, these matters will be further considered as part of future detailed planning applications.

6.43 In relation to concerns that the building densities and heights will promote anti-social behaviour, this has not been something demonstrated within other city centre developments. For example in Spinningfields a number of factors have contributed to the safety within the area. These include; the mix of uses, legible routes and public spaces that encourage footfall and people to move through the area, the critical mass of activity which promotes vibrancy and natural surveillance, good lighting and public realm design, and adoption of secure by design principles in consultation with GM Police. This approach is demonstrated within the Piccadilly Basin SRF.

Waterways

6.44 It is considered that new development should define the canal corridor in line with the history of built form and grain of this area. New development should animate and overlook the canal side and promote access and safe passage along this important city centre asset. A 15 metre set back as requested in the consultation responses would merely create an incidental linear space that would be limited in its use. The proposed strategy of an interlinked network of new spaces, linked to a hierarchy of pedestrian routes and connections through the site is considered to form a much more appropriate solution.

6.45 Matters relating to the sites ecology will be considered as part of future detailed planning applications where detailed ecological assessments will be required and undertaken.
6.46 Access to the canal network and new / existing open space is emphasised as part of the SRF and clearly demonstrated on the masterplan layout. This will ensure that new development will serve to enhance access and animation of the Rochdale Canal within the SRF area.

The consultation process

6.47 With regards to comments received as part of the consultation process the purpose of the Strategic Regeneration Framework should be noted. The document is a high level masterplan and set of principles to provide a framework against which detailed proposals can come forward in the future. These proposals will be further interrogated and considered at the planning application stage in accordance with national and local policy requirements. As planning submissions are brought forward, residents and stakeholders will have the opportunity to comment on detailed applications.

6.48 Comments received have been carefully considered and adjustments made to the SRF as a consequence of this consultation.

6.49 With regards to the consultation period, a seven week response period was given for respondent which exceeds statutory guidelines. Should any particular community group express an interest in meeting to discuss the proposals this is something that could be arranged with the land owners. The principal landowner is committed to further consultation as detailed proposals come forward.

6.50 The consultation process has resulted in a significant level of response raising a range of similarly themed issues. It is now clear what the principal concerns are for the local community. A more directed consultation would not have provided as much scope for people to raise their thoughts and questions.

Definition of the Piccadilly Basin area

6.51 In relation to the boundary of the Piccadilly Basin area, the buildings referred to for inclusion sit within the Northern Quarter. The Northern Quarter and Piccadilly Basin sit adjacent to one another and subsequently the proposals outlined within the SRF have been designed to complement the Northern Quarter, however it is important that the two areas are distinguished from one another. The Northern Quarter and Piccadilly Basin will posses different uses and characteristics and therefore the boundaries for the Piccadilly Basin area have been set to reflect this.

Housing

6.52 All new residential development in Manchester for sites of more than 0.3 hectares or 15 units are required to be considered against Policy H8. This is referenced at paragraph 3.37 of the SRF. The mix of units will be determined on a site by site basis as detailed designs come forward and in line with Manchester City Council’s policy requirements and residential growth strategy.
6.53 The affordable housing strategy which was recently endorsed by the Council sets out the city’s approach to enhancing access to affordable housing across Manchester.

**Public transport, cycling and pedestrian use**

6.54 The SRF document references the proximity of the site to key cycle routes and therefore the opportunity to promote cycling and cycle access. This means that any new development coming forward as a planning application will need to demonstrate how this is achieved.

6.55 The SRF promotes cycling; walking and public transport but also takes a realistic view on the future parking needs of residents and visitors.

6.56 High quality cycle parking and amenities will be required and secured as part of the development and will be addressed through the consideration of future planning applications.

**The Strategic Regeneration framework document**

6.57 The SRF principles deliver against all 6 of the city’s sustained growth priorities. Further clarity has been given to this within the final SRF document.

6.58 The inaccuracies / errors proposed by the interest group outlined in sections 8.18 – 8.21 have been checked and amended as required in the final SRF document.

**Economic context**

6.59 It is difficult to predict the impact of Brexit. The economic conditions and competitive advantages that have supported Manchester’s growth over a sustained period still exist and the Manchester post Brexit has clearly indicated that it is ‘open for business.’ At this stage it would be inappropriate to change the strategy.

6.60 It is entirely appropriate to safeguard this important economic opportunity for Manchester in the context of its most recent economic growth forecasts.

**Families, communities and wellbeing**

6.61 Increasing opportunities for families in the city centre continues to be a priority for the city. However, the Piccadilly Basin area, in accordance with Manchester’s Residential Growth Strategy, will be best suited to apartment development and supply for young people, who are the most significant driver of residential development in the city centre, and in turn the economic prospects of the city.

Manchester’s Residential Growth Strategy supersedes this general Core Strategy policy. Whilst an element of family housing is likely to be desirable
and should be considered as proposals come forward, the principal driver of city centre housing are the young skilled workers that are essential to future economic prospects and productivity of the city. The priority is to attract, retain and grow young talent. On this basis, family housing is unlikely to be the principle or most appropriate form of housing within this site. The Residential Growth Strategy states that family housing will be encouraged in the city in areas where there is strong demand.

6.62 The provision of green space and access to the canal will assist in reducing stress and encourage interaction and a sense of community.

Additional comments

6.63 The existing Billboards mentioned in a response are not a matter for consideration as part of the SRF. Such proposals are considered by the Local Planning Authority under Advertisement Control. In terms of the SRF area, a consistent strategy with regard to signage will be required to be developed and put forward as proposals come forward.

6.64 Tariff Street and the other local roads within the Piccadilly Basin have had little maintenance investment over recently as there are large swathes of the neighbourhood that are currently vacant or used as interim surface car parking. The delivery of the Strategic Regeneration Framework will generate the development activity, business / resident occupation and associated funds that can be invested in the affected streets. In terms of road widths of Tariff Street is in average 6.8m wide. This lane width is further reduced by on street parking typically on one side reducing the widths down to 4.8m.

6.65 It was also suggested the surface level car park is the only place to turn a vehicle at present. The local grid of streets offers a variety of route options allowing users to loop back on themselves in the area, avoiding or minimising the need for awkward manoeuvres.

6.66 The delivery timescales outlined within the SRF are considered to be appropriate and realistic for such a complex, multi-phase regeneration project. Where market conditions support acceleration in the programme that will be acted upon.

6.67 Live music venues are unlikely to be compatible with the proposed mix of uses within the SRF area. It should be noted that Manchester continues to see the introduction a new performance spaces and venues within the city centre, within close proximity to Piccadilly Basin.

6.68 New development will come forward as quickly as possible according to market conditions. Town Centre Securities, the principal partner in Belgravia Living has an extensive track record of delivering new development.

6.69 Filming will be able to continue within the Northern Quarter as it has historically done. The site in its current use as surface car parks would not have featured in the filming mentioned within the consultation responses.
6.70 Any development proposals will need to be supported by a detailed Archaeological Assessment. No development will be able to come forward without appropriate investigation and where necessary mitigation.

7.0 Response to stakeholder comments

7.1 It is acknowledged that the document should make stronger reference to landowners within the SRF area other than Belgravia Living. This has been reinforced within the final version of the SRF.

7.2 Figures 4.7 & 4.8 within the SRF have been reviewed and amended as required to accurately reflect the current scale and uses of land within the final document.

7.3 The SRF has been amended to accurately reflect the Store Street development scheme.

7.4 The land swap agreement between Zerum and Belgravia Living has been agreed. Should a change in the footprint outlined within the SRF be proposed, this will need to be considered by the Council’s planning committee.

7.5 In relation to the indicative height and GEA of buildings E & F within the SRF, it is felt this reflects a small change which could be justified in terms of massing and stepping down to the existing grain.

7.6 A response felt a pedestrian route between E & F is not appropriate, we support the removal of this within the final SRF as the route doesn’t actually lead anywhere as building G blocks the route. The key pedestrian route (n – s) is positioned at the side of Brownsfield Mill.

7.7 In relation to delivery timescales, nothing has yet been indicated relating to the proposals concerning Zerum. Subsequently the SRF has been amended to reflect that it is a separate phase being brought forward by a separate party as opposed to identifying it as a 6th phase.

8.0 Response to statutory / public organisations comments

8.1 The comments raised by TfGM relating to; active frontages at ground level, enhanced permeability and promotion of public transport, cycling and walking are all addressed within the SRF.

8.2 Early consultation with Historic England at pre-planning application stage is noted and accepted as a recommendation. Development principles will be further refined and developed as individual applications come forward in consultation with Historic England.

8.3 The response from Historic England highlights the challenges for the development in relation to the potential to impact the setting of the Grade II* building.
Historic England note that the SRF sets out high level principles for
development, and these would be refined and developed as individual
applications come forward. It is therefore recognised that the development of
proposals for this site would be done working closely with HE.

8.4 Consideration of the historic assets in and around the site has been a key part
of forming the development principles. The important link between place-
making and the site’s heritage assets, and other character features is a key
matter within the SRF strategy.

8.5 The masterplan building footprints are placed in order to maximise the number
of active elevations towards the canal, which is viewed as a principal feature.
In addition, the SRF also recognises the importance of high quality public
realm in complementing both architectural proposals but to also in order to
improve the tow path and the subsequent experience of the canal and
associated listed buildings. Key views have been identified by heritage
architects in their work and consideration of the impact of development upon
these views has also been duly considered.

8.6 A holistic approach has been applied to the development of proposals for the
framework. This translates to the breakdown the whole masterplan area into
smaller Character Areas. These areas are individual in their response to the
context of their location but have commonalities between them to ensure that
they contribute towards the masterplan area as a whole. The architectural
Character Areas are also responsive to the Character Areas set out in chapter
5.1 of the heritage architects input document.

8.7 The proposals to the area to the east of Carver’s Warehouse have been
subject to the above general considerations for the site. They are
encapsulated within their own specific character area. Developments will be
mixed-use, but commercially led, which in part has been informed by the uses
at Carver’s Warehouse following its renovation. The footprints and heights of
the proposed buildings are also deliberately responsive to the buildings in
immediate proximity of them. In addition to this pedestrian routes have been
included that will enhance the experience of the canal and landscaped
squares in this Character Area will also encourage pedestrian activity from
surrounding areas.

8.8 The site to the east of the Carver’s Warehouse has been substantially altered.
Despite having originally had an open canal arm, the site was also largely
inaccessible and heavily developed with warehousing.

8.9 This site represents a nodal point between the formal street grid of the
Northern Quarter and the more ad-hoc, informal development around the
former canal network. Consequently, it is recognised that this site is a key
interface between two distinct character areas and this will be reflected in the
design development of the site. There revised draft SRF reinforces the need
for contrast between the layout of the streets within the Piccadilly Basin area
and the grid of the neighbouring Stephenson Square conservation area.
8.10 As existing, the surface car park and poor urban form of the setting to the east of Carver’s Warehouse does not contribute to the special interest of the building; it is considered that through design development and careful consideration of the public realm much could be done to enhance the setting of the building.

8.11 In relation to Carver’s Warehouse, the revised draft SRF reinforces the importance of enhancing the setting of the building and in doing so maximising the inherent heritage qualities and appeal of the area with an emphasis on place making.

9.0 Conclusions

9.1 The Piccadilly Basin area is a key area of city centre with significant potential to contribute towards the regeneration and growth ambitions of the city. It is a highly accessible location sitting adjacent to Piccadilly Station and the inner ring road. Regeneration of the area and delivery of a mixed use neighbourhood will provide a significant number of new homes and jobs within the regions economic hub.

9.2 Connections between the Basin and the wider Piccadilly area are vital, in order to maximise the impact of the planned investment at the station and within the wider area. The Piccadilly Basin SRF is informed by the existing Piccadilly SRF, and complements the developing growth strategy for the Piccadilly area. It is further aligned and complements adjacent city centre development strategies including Mayfield and Ancoats / New Islington.

9.3 As outlined in section 6.25, the provision of vehicle parking will be kept under review. This will ensure provision is at the most appropriate level and ensure the correct mix of uses within the neighbourhood.

The following amends have been made to the revised draft Piccadilly Basin SRF:

9.4 The importance of the spatial characteristics of the SRF area has been referenced within the SRF these include key views and the setting of the canal in order to ensure appropriate and distinctive development. The framework also now highlights the importance of character features in relation to place making.

9.5 The SRF reinforces the need for contrast and differentiation between the Piccadilly Basin area and the layout, principles and design of the adjacent Northern Quarter neighbourhood.

9.6 The revised document highlights the need to give particular attention to development around the Grade II* Brownsfield Mill, Grade II* Jacksons Warehouse and grouping of Grade II Carvers Warehouse/Rochdale Canal office and arch, in acknowledgment of the importance of these amenities to their setting.
9.7 Revisions have been made to the documents heritage design principles which highlight the importance of the areas heritage assets and how development should interface with these.

9.8 Further emphasis and reference is given in relation to place making throughout the SRF.

9.9 Increased prominence within the SRF has been given to the role of public realm and green space within the development. This includes the commitment to relocate the grow boxes raised as an asset of the community in the consultation exercise. Dialogue around this will be taken forward with both the land owner and the Friends of the Northern Quarter grow boxes.

9.10 The SRF highlights that any proposal would have to be fully justified in the context of relevant legislation, Government guidance and local planning policies as a detailed planning application is brought forward. Consultation will also continue with residents and stakeholders, including business owners, throughout the redevelopment process.

Recommendations appear at the front of the report.

10.0 Key Polices and Considerations

(a) Equal Opportunities

10.1 A key aim of the redevelopment of Piccadilly Basin redevelopment is to provide high quality homes, to meet increasing levels of demand for housing within the regional hub and in close proximity to the employment opportunities of the city centre. There is a commitment to ensure that design standards comply with the highest standards of accessibility.

(b) Risk Management

10.2 Not applicable

(c) Legal Considerations

10.3 None
Piccadilly Basin SRF: Appendix – Indicative Masterplan