

**Manchester City Council
Report for Resolution**

Report to: Executive - 8 March 2017
Subject: North Campus 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, businesses and key stakeholders on the draft Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) for North Campus, responds to the issues raised, and seeks the Executive's approval and endorsement of the final SRF.

Recommendations

The Executive is recommended to:

- i. Note the comments received on the Strategic Regeneration Framework 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 North Campus 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 area.
-

Wards Affected:

City Centre

Manchester Strategy outcomes	Summary of the contribution to the strategy
A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities	Given the site's prominent location within Corridor Manchester and in close proximity to Piccadilly Station, the site has the potential to attract new businesses and jobs into the city centre. The site will also be the location of the new Graphene Engineering Innovation Centre (GEIC), which will provide highly skilled jobs and commercialisation opportunities for local businesses, attracting other science, technology, advanced materials and research based business growth and jobs into the area.

	<p>The regeneration framework will also deliver new residential accommodation at a key gateway to the city centre. This will contribute towards meeting the increasing demand for city centre homes.</p>
<p>A highly skilled city: world class and home grown talent sustaining the city's economic success</p>	<p>Development at North Campus will improve connectivity to Corridor Manchester, Mayfield and other areas of the city centre, enabling more people to access the educational facilities and employment opportunities located there. The site has the potential to accommodate significant new jobs, at a range of levels, particularly in science and technology.</p> <p>The residential development provided at North Campus will allow talent that is both home grown and new to the city to live close to the range of new job opportunities created through the developed commercial, learning, retail and cultural offer in the city centre.</p>
<p>A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities</p>	<p>Local employment will be maximised from this initiative. The scheme will provide new connections to other parts of the city centre, including Corridor Manchester, Circle Square and Mayfield. The area will also provide new leisure opportunities, accessible to all residents.</p>
<p>A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work</p>	<p>Development at North Campus has the potential to deliver a major mixed use scheme, and an enhanced gateway to the city centre, which can become a desirable location in which to live and work. New and improved public realm will be provided, resulting in an improved local environment for this part of the city centre.</p> <p>Close to Piccadilly Station and Oxford Road, the area is well connected to all forms of public transport, minimising the need for car journeys to and from the area, and pedestrian and cycle routes will be prioritised.</p>
<p>A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth</p>	<p>As outlined above, the site benefits from good access to all forms of public transport. As part of the development, new pedestrian connections from Piccadilly Station to Corridor Manchester and other areas of the city centre, including Mayfield.</p>

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

- Equal Opportunities Policy
- Risk Management
- Legal Considerations

Financial Consequences – Revenue

None

Financial Consequences – Capital

There are no financial consequences resulting from this report.

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 Manager
Telephone: 0161 234 4567
E-mail: d.roscoe@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Pat Bartoli
Position: Head of 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.

- Report to Executive – North Campus SRF – 14 December 2016
- Manchester Corridor North Campus Strategic Regeneration Framework March 2017.
- Corridor Manchester Strategic Vision to 2025

All held in Room 303, Town Hall

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 On 14 December 2016, the Executive endorsed, in principle, a Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) for North Campus, 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 SRF.

2.0 The Consultation Process

- 2.1 Consultation letters have been sent out to 1,726 local residents, businesses, and stakeholders informing them about the public consultation, how to engage in the consultation process, and where to access the SRF. The SRF was made available on the Council's website, and comments were invited.
- 2.2 The formal consultation closed on 14 February 2016, following a six week period of consultation.
- 2.3 In total 93 responses were received to the consultation, broken down as follows:
 - 87 from individual residents
 - 3 from interest groups
 - 1 from a business stakeholder
 - 1 from a statutory/public organisation
 - 1 from city centre ward Councillors.

3.0 Consultation comments

- 3.1 In response to the consultation, a range of issues were raised by respondents. These are all within the following categories;
 - Green space & public realm
 - Heritage and existing buildings
 - Proposed uses
 - Building heights
 - Connectivity and sustainability
 - The SRF document
 - The consultation process
 - General

Green space & public realm

- 3.2 A significant proportion of the individual responses received relate to green space within the SRF area, with a number of these respondents stating that their concerns are based solely on issues with the proposals for green space.
- 3.3 A particular focus of individual respondents, the response of the Friends of Angel Meadows interest group and City Centre Councillors was the opposition

to any reduction in green space within the SRF area, in particular reducing the size of the area known as Vimto Park.

- 3.4 A number of respondents felt that the reduction of Vimto Park would provide an insignificant floor space gain which could easily be gained elsewhere within the SRF area.
- 3.5 A respondent commented that a reduction in the size of Vimto Park will result in increased crime and anti-social behaviour within the North Campus area.
- 3.6 Respondents expressed the view that the proposals outlined within the SRF do not compensate for the loss of green space, stating that Vimto Park and the adjacent landscaping should be retained as it currently exists, as it enhances the heritage of the area, is well functioning and adds to the status of Granby Row.
- 3.7 Comments describe Vimto Park as an important piece of green infrastructure within the city centre. One respondent stated that the SRF proposes new development within the gardens, to *'help give the park a more intimate, city centre feel'*, however this same objective could be better achieved through placing a building along the Princess Street frontage which would also provide the opportunity for a *'journey through greenspaces'*
- 3.8 Further specific comments made relating to green space within the North Campus area included:
 - A change of approach is required in relation to safeguarding and enhancing the city's green spaces as there are very few green spaces within the city centre.
 - There should be no reduction in green space; Manchester already has less green space (20.4%) than other comparable cities, Birmingham (24.6%) and Sheffield (22.1).
 - Two respondents commented that reducing green space within the area contradicts the Council's ambition of ensuring the city centre is an attractive place for families to live.
 - Two respondents felt that the proposals contradict the aims of the SRF which details that green space is "much needed" and will be critical in creating a unique sense of place.
 - The development proposals will see an increased number of people living, working and visiting the area, which combined with adjacent development at London Road Fire Station and Kampus, justifies the retention of significant areas of green space.
 - The well landscaped area has been historically well maintained, however a noticeable recent decline has been noted. The area remains a popular yet peaceful, widely used area of public realm enjoyed by residents.

- The green space and public realm provides North Campus with a unique sense of place distinctive from other spaces within the city centre.
- The city centre currently offers a number of smaller green spaces. Uniting the green spaces south of the viaduct would be preferable, to enable the creation of a single bigger park that could act as a main public space.
- The public realm must be designed appropriately, to withstand a range of elements including rain, wind, heat, heavy footfall and potential vandalism.
- North Campus' green space has a positive impact on the physical and mental health and wellbeing of those living, visiting and working within the city centre.
- The public realm could focus around and enhance a retail offer within the viaduct arches.
- Many of the trees and plants within the SRF area will need to be protected.
- The public realm within the SRF area provides a wealth of city wildlife that in a fast growing city is scarce.
- Green roofs, while laudable, often have accessibility constraints and become undeveloped or unmaintained.
- To achieve best use of green space, the area listed as Parisier Park should be changed to an open facing triangular park. Extending this to the tip of Renold Park will create linked green spaces that will allow for enhanced connectivity.
- The large city centre open spaces including St Peter's Square are improving, however these are primarily hard landscaped spaces. Development of North Campus should be delivered alongside the retention of open green spaces.
- Regeneration of the neighbouring Ardwick area will see the loss of 28,000 m² of green space and over 300 public mature trees. To access green space, a number of Ardwick residents visit North Campus including Vimto Park.
- The SRF contains no reference to the currently culverted River Medlock as an opportunity with the area. This is not aligned with the document's emphasis on distinctiveness, character, open space and sustaining or enhancing ecological value.

- The Council ignores its S.106 Agreement or Community Infrastructure Levy powers over developers which should be used to help create, fund and enhance public spaces.
- Any loss of green spaces in the city will increase pressure on the remaining parks and gardens and those who help maintain them, including at St. Michael's Flags & Angel Meadow.
- City Centre Councillors welcome proposals to retain the existing level of green space within the SRF area, and enhance the quality of these spaces. However they added that a distinction should be made between trees and shrubbery and open, accessible space.
- City Centre Councillors also commented that the development of an area for child friendly green space would be welcomed.

Heritage and existing buildings

3.9 A significant proportion of the responses received relate to heritage or existing buildings within the North Campus SRF area, this included responses from the Modernist and 20th Century Societies. A number of these comments focused on the area's modernist architecture, expressing the view that these buildings should be retained as part of any development. City Centre Councillors also felt that the 20th Century architecture should be preserved where possible. Specific comments included:

- Modernist architecture of the 1960's is equally as critical as the city's Victorian buildings. These buildings demonstrate aesthetic value and pioneering architectural features unique to that era.
- The city does not appear to value its post-war heritage. Some of the buildings within the SRF area represent some of the finest examples of post war architecture in the UK.
- Demolishing these examples of architecture demonstrates a short term view, as interest will continue to increase in such buildings that will not be built again.
- Reusing the buildings would be more ecological and cost efficient than demolishing and building new structures.
- The preservation of the architecture within the North Campus area will play a role in achieving the city's goal of attracting and retaining graduates.
- The city has prided itself on its character and industrial heritage by preserving its neoclassical and gothic buildings. The modernist buildings within the SRF area mark a further point in the city's development and should not be dismissed.

- The SRF states that preserving and enhancing the area's wealth of historic features is a priority, however this is not achieved through the proposals presented.
- The UMIST campus would benefit from a refresh along with enhancements to the area's accessibility. However, the scale of the proposals destroy more existing infrastructure than necessary.
- Two respondents commented that the architecture within the area adds to the city's historical and cultural offer and acts as a tourist attraction.
- Whilst the planned development is exciting, Manchester's universities offer some of the finest architecture in the city. The existing buildings should remain part of the narrative, with new development that complements the sites modernist architecture.
- North Campus already has a strong sense of place which is attributable to its architecture, landscaping and public art.
- The Council should look to develop elsewhere within the city, and acknowledge that the existing buildings within the North Campus SRF area are iconic symbols of the city's culture, science and educational prowess.
- Whilst the growth and evolution of the city is fully appreciated, the Council must seek to balance development with the long term appearance and appeal of the city.
- Listed status should not be the only consideration in the development of proposals for North Campus, as the sum of the buildings collectively is greater than their individual merit.
- The UMIST area is a conservation area and the SRF does not clearly acknowledge the statutory implications regarding both the conservation area and listed buildings.
- The sketches of Renold Court, Renold Street, Jackson Court, illustrate buildings that appear constructed of glass or cladding. New buildings should match the historical design of the area using brick facades.

Further comments received related to specific existing buildings within the SRF, including the following:

- 3.10 The interventions proposed by creating an access through Sackville building would damage an important piece of heritage for little benefit. The improvements in pedestrian connectivity do not justify this intervention as the proposals for Coburg Street would sufficiently enhance permeability into the site.

- 3.11 New access that would be created via the development of the Sackville building doesn't link well to the main site south of the viaduct, which is the area in need of greater access.
- 3.12 The reuse of existing buildings within the SRF area, including the railway arches and Sackville building would be welcomed.
- 3.13 A respondent has been advised that a covenant exists on the Sackville building which stipulates that it can only be used for educational purposes.
- 3.14 Shaping the SRF around the Sackville building is a misinterpretation of the existing urban form. A more appropriate foundation would be the area's substantial former warehouses of around six storeys in height.
- 3.15 Both the Modernist and 20th Century Societies along with a number of individual respondents commented on the Renold building, stating that it is a unique example of modernist design and subsequently should be unaltered and retained. Specific comments were made relating to the retention of the 'podium' element of the building and recognising the Renold building within the SRF as a non heritage asset.
- 3.16 Further responses raised concern as to whether the demolition of the Renold building would see the removal of Hans Tisdall's 'the Elements mosaics', and the Victor Pasmore mural, which should be highlighted as heritage assets.
- 3.17 Two individual respondents reference the Barnes Wallis and Pariser buildings as unique assets that should be retained and enhanced. The Modernist Society add that the Chemical Engineering Pilot Plant, Maths and Social Science, Chandos Hall and Ferranti buildings should receive the same treatment.
- 3.18 The Modernist and 20th Century Societies along with a number of individual respondents commented that the SRF disregards the listed structure status of the Hollaway Wall. It is commented that option 1 set out within the SRF conflicts with National Planning Policy Framework, which states that a positive strategy should be sought for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. Further comment states that options 2 & 3 could potentially damage what is considered to be a rare and significant example of an architectural sculpture, and an example of a post-war collaboration between architects and artists. The view is provided that the SRF should consider the Hollaway Wall as an asset rather than a barrier to development and access.
- 3.19 Two further respondents agreed that the Hollaway Wall should be retained due to its significant mid-century heritage, adding that option 2 set out within the SRF presented the best option and option 3 would likely detract from the wall.
- 3.20 The heritage significance diagram produced by Stephen Levrant Heritage Architecture makes no reference to the Grade II listed Hollaway wall. Furthermore on page 33 of the SRF the length of the sculptural wall is

inaccurate and on page 34 the wall does not appear on the plans and the affronting green space is omitted from the diagram.

- 3.21 Two responses referred to Jacksons Mill, with one respondent disagreeing with the building's heritage assessment as 'low value', and the second adding that retention of the building would provide the site with historical context and complement buildings on Whitworth Street.

Proposed uses

Comments received on the proposed uses for the site outlined within the SRF included:

- 3.22 Technology and scientific purposes seem to be the optimum use due to the site's proximity to the Graphene Engineering Innovation Centre (GEIC) and universities. These uses could be further emphasised within the SRF.
- 3.23 Two respondents commented that the proposed mixture of uses within the neighbourhood (technology / scientific and residential), were conflicting and residential use seemed an underutilisation of such a well connected, central, site. It was suggested that high quality commercial space would better complement scientific/ technology uses. One of the respondents added that a single much taller landmark building, located away from Sackville building, may be a more appropriate way of delivering residential development.
- 3.24 In contrast, another respondent felt that due to the University of Manchester's campus consolidation, the area will become largely redundant, and it was pleasing to see that proposals include residential accommodation and potentially R&D space rather than exclusively commercial and retail.
- 3.25 City Centre Councillors support the sites proposed educational uses, however, request that future exploration is undertaken to establish the viability of the site for housing a secondary school.
- 3.26 The range of uses proposed by the SRF are supported, it will remain important that the proposals are capable to responding to the changing needs of the city.
- 3.27 The SRF lacks discussion on housing typologies and affordable housing and seems based on a maximum profit model rather than establishing long-term neighbourhood benefits. More detail could be provided on the mix of residential accommodation proposed, with consideration given to the creation of family orientated homes.
- 3.28 City Centre Councillors felt that emphasis should be given to an owner occupation residential offer rather than accommodation for the rental market, adding that this will help to create a stable community.
- 3.29 The PRS residential model erodes passionate home ownership and civic life, building transience into the city.

- 3.30 Could the residential development be relocated to the southern section of the SRF area, as in its current location there may be noise issues from both car and rail traffic.
- 3.31 The SRF does not include any reference to the civic amenities needed to support the growing number of families living in the city centre for example schools, doctors, cultural facilities and libraries.
- 3.32 Delivering up to 2,500 more flats in addition to 400-500 hotel rooms will place pressure on the existing space. More accommodation will mean increases in noise, litter and traffic that will reduce the quality of life currently enjoyed by existing residents.
- 3.33 In contrast, a respondent said that they would welcome the introduction of new businesses, homeowners and a new hotel, stating that this would revitalise the North Campus area and link it with the regeneration plans for Kampus and Mayfield.
- 3.34 Due to the size of the Sackville building, its proximity to the Principal Hotel, and the number of hotels located within a ten minute walk, it was felt further hotel provision would be non-viable.
- 3.35 Whilst active frontages are welcomed, commercial demand must be assessed in this area. In addition the larger chain businesses that the units may attract are not necessarily helpful to the development of a community atmosphere.
- 3.36 The SRF references "Policy H12 Student Housing", however the neighbourhood already has a high student population and many of the current problems with noise and litter are linked to that.
- 3.37 In contrast, the business respondent commented that the absence of support for student accommodation within the SRF seems to be a missed opportunity, given the importance of high quality accommodation in attracting students to the city's universities from both the UK and overseas. This response added that it is not viable for Chandos Hall to meet the necessary health and safety requirements and quality standards beyond the end of the 2016/17 academic year, and as a result, the building will not be let to students for the 17/18 academic year. The response adds that there would an ambition to redevelop the Chandos Hall site to include a mix of high quality residential accommodation.

Building heights

A number of concerns were raised relating to the proposed height of buildings, and in particular their impact on surrounding buildings. Comments were as follows:

- 3.38 The 21 storey building proposed for Sackville Street would severely affect the natural daylight for existing residents of Velvet House with two of the proposed developments positioned opposite apartments within Granby House.

- 3.39 Tall buildings on Sackville Street are not viable when compared to those along London Road. Granby Row already has the Principal, Manchester Hotel and Student Castle as tall buildings to end the vista. Further tall buildings will have a detrimental effect on the heritage value of existing buildings such as Orient House and Granby House, and should instead be positioned along London Road, particularly in the north east corner of the site where there is the potential for a very tall building to be located next to Piccadilly Station, where transport connections are excellent. This would demonstrate a consistent approach by the Council in relation to taller buildings at gateway locations.
- 3.40 The proposed Cobourg Street extension to the Sackville building would utilise an unused area of grass. However, a tall building built next to, or on top of, Chandos Hall into the green space, would result in the area becoming impacted by darkness.
- 3.41 Whilst tall buildings help with density, they also pose a risk of creating a poor aesthetic environment with poor air, light and visibility. Tall buildings should be positioned within the inner core with much flatter dispersed outer areas.
- 3.42 No rationale is provided within the SRF for the number of tall buildings proposed. A reduction in emphasis on high density and tall buildings within the SRF would enable better preservation of the areas character and existing buildings where possible.
- 3.43 Both the Renold Street and Charles Street residential buildings proposed should be limited to the height of residential buildings in the surrounding Whitworth Street conservation area (8 storeys).
- 3.44 The SRF lacks consideration for the provision of natural light in any of the green spaces. The development heights and density proposed will lead to the area feeling overdeveloped, dark and claustrophobic.
- 3.45 Tall buildings are not the only means of demarcating gateways where they truly exist.
- 3.46 The Modernists Society commented that one of the SRF areas best qualities is its low density development, adding that increasing this density would conflict with the placemaking ambitions of the city.
- 3.47 The massing indicated on page 83 of the SRF is increased from that of the Whitworth Street conservation area, upon whose qualities it is argued to draw earlier in the document.
- 3.48 Whilst City Centre Councillors note the desire to increase density driven by growth, jobs creation and housing demand, retaining the relaxed, non-rigid feel of the existing site would be welcomed.

Connectivity and sustainability

Specific comments were made in relation to connectivity and sustainability. These were as follows:

- 3.49 The sustainability section within the SRF is short and incomplete. Almost all of the sustainability claims within the SRF are generic statements that lack site specificity.
- 3.50 The proposed new through road routes should help to improve the heavily congested London Road / Fairfield junction and Whitworth Street.
- 3.51 Cycle storage referenced within the SRF is an important component of proposals. Providing adequate facilities will ensure the development's sustainability.
- 3.52 The proximity to Piccadilly Station means there is great potential for both North Campus, and also connecting the areas to the north and south-west.
- 3.53 Subject to the retention of green space within Vimto Park and enhancement of the area's connections, the North Campus project is a very positive addition to the city that will also benefit the immediate neighbouring areas.
- 3.54 Based on the proposals within the SRF, the area will be impacted by a significant increase in traffic. Currently the area is a traffic free pedestrian and cycle route out of the city centre towards south Manchester, however the proposal to add through roads would damage both the atmosphere and landscaping of the campus.
- 3.55 Making London Road more of a traditional main road would be desirable for the area, providing traffic calming and active street frontages. Removing the central reservations and continuing Travis Street into the site would achieve this in addition to connecting the site to Mayfield. This proposal is restricted by the Hollaway Wall and therefore relocation of the wall to another part of the site for example as a back wall or internal partition for buildings along London Road would be beneficial.
- 3.56 As the area is bounded by the Mancunian Way, it should therefore remain as open as possible.
- 3.57 The SRF does not attempt to link with existing residential areas south of the Mancunian Way including the communities of the Grosvenor and Brunswick Estates.
- 3.58 The pedestrian walkway and cycle path illustrated on page 58 of the SRF does not contain a natural thoroughfare through North Campus to Piccadilly. A green corridor, under the flyover and sliproad and through both Parisier and Renold parks, to the eastern end of Altrincham Street would be ideal for pedestrians and cyclists.
- 3.59 The permeability study within the SRF does not take into account the Mancunian Way, the railway arches, the lack of safe crossings between

Piccadilly and Fairfield Street and the lack of a uniform gradient. The permeability study should also be linked with Circle Square to encourage pedestrian and cyclist through flow from Oxford Road.

- 3.60 Current car parking is well used and directs traffic to the fringe of the North Campus site. Moving the parking offer will add to traffic at the core of the site and increase distance between vehicle parking and the University of Manchester sites.
- 3.61 In contrast a respondent commented that there is sufficient vehicle parking located in close proximity, and the North Campus site should not contain parking provision. It is added that this will encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport and positively impact on local air quality.
- 3.62 Government agencies and local organisations such as Manchester Friends of the Earth have highlighted high levels of air pollution in central Manchester. These issues are not meaningfully addressed within the SRF, and the proposals to incorporate a new vehicular road through the SRF area should be reconsidered. Emphasis should instead be placed on pedestrian and bike routes within the area. In addition to this the SRF should be amended to ensure mature tree cover is provided in order to reduce air pollution.

The SRF document

A number of specific issues were raised in relation to the SRF document. These were as follows:

- 3.63 Whilst the SRF is not intended at this stage to address the detail of individual streets and buildings, the document clearly indicates some substantial formal proposals that undoubtedly frame and provide an approval context for future development.
- 3.64 The image used on the second page of the document is quite old, predating the completion of the Alan Gilbert Learning Commons on Oxford Road and Birley Fields Campus in Hulme.
- 3.65 The key strengths and limitations of the site detailed are well described with good solutions sought.
- 3.66 The principles set out that refer to respect for heritage and green space and the inclusion of spaces for technology sector businesses are not observed in the SRF.
- 3.67 The title of the document "Strategic Regeneration Framework" is confusing.
- 3.68 The way in which SRF's are produced and subsequently sites developed is a concern. At St Michael's, it has been observed that Zerum and Make prepared the SRF and are in the process of developing the site as developer and architect, which represents a conflict of interest.

- 3.69 The SRF is vague on the extent of regeneration and fails to make explicitly clear which buildings will be demolished.
- 3.70 The SRF states that suggestions have been made for the possible retention of buildings where appropriate, however the term 'where appropriate' would benefit from further explanation alongside any relevant legislation or directive.
- 3.71 The SRF describes development being complementary to the University of Manchester, supporting their goals and values. Clarity on which specific goals and values of the University have been addressed via the SRF would be beneficial.
- 3.72 The illustration on page 43 should include a key.
- 3.73 The key on page 59 illustrates blue as 'existing grain' and yellow as 'new grain', however the new streets are shown in blue which is incorrect.

The consultation process

A number of concerns were raised relating to the consultation process, these were as follows:

- 3.74 The consultation on the North Campus SRF will have little impact on the Council's decision.
- 3.75 The Council failed to let the residents of Granby House know about the consultation.
- 3.76 A respondent thanked the Council for inviting residents to comment on the proposals for North Campus.
- 3.77 A respondent asked for clarification on who had been invited to participate in the consultation. While a second respondent adding that the public has only been made aware of this consultation through the Modernist Society.
- 3.78 It is concerning that the proposals detailed within the North Campus SRF have not been widely available, reducing the opportunity for public comment prior to publishing.

General

Positive comments in support of the regeneration plans for North Campus included the following:

- 3.79 The development proposals outlined within the North Campus SRF are a great start, and proposals to open up the area and improve access are fully supported.
- 3.80 The SRF and its objectives are strongly supported and recognition of the sites potential to make a significant contribution to the future success of the city

centre is welcomed. The North Campus area is an important redevelopment opportunity and a co-ordinated and planned approach for its regeneration is vital.

- 3.81 City Centre Councillors welcome the regeneration of this area and are in broad agreement with the principles of the SRF.
- 3.82 Two respondents stated their broad support for the SRF adding that the proposal should, however, include the reuse and regeneration of some good architecture currently within the SRF area.
- 3.83 The economic value and benefits of utilising the land are clear, however development would be at the expense of a historically important area.
- 3.84 The area requires redevelopment, with the University consolidating its Oxford Road campus.
- 3.85 Coburg Street is currently underused and proposals for Sackville Court/Coburg Street are broadly supported.
- 3.86 Efforts are welcomed to regenerate the old UMIST campus which was once a lively part of the city.
- 3.87 As a resident, worker and experienced researcher of Manchester urban development the proposals are exciting.
- 3.88 As a historically significant site, there is the opportunity to do something different, making the area unique. The site offers the chance for Manchester to have a standout, architectural masterpiece amongst its urban landscape similar to the visionary Vienna University campus design.
- 3.89 The proposed sculptural feature staircase over Renold Court is fully supported.

A number of more general comments opposed the regeneration plans, and specific suggestions were also received as outlined below:

- 3.90 The SRF contains no increased merit in aesthetic or function, meaning the proposals must have been developed to prioritise financial returns.
- 3.91 The city is at risk of losing its status as a unique city as the landscape, architecture and developments mirror other UK cities.
- 3.92 The boundary of the SRF is currently focused on land / buildings within the University of Manchester estate, omitting land between Fairfield Street, London Road, the railway viaduct and Cobourg Street and south of the viaduct between Sackville Street and Princess Street. Expanding this boundary would have further regeneration benefits.

- 3.93 Another notable omission is the land fronting Princess Street to the west of the SRF boundary, occupied by Weston Hall and the Pendulum Hotel and conference centre. The inclusion of the Pendulum Hotel and conference centre would present the opportunity to 'complete' the part of the SRF to the south of the viaduct and to the west of Princess Street, and would provide an opportunity to improve connections from the North Campus across to Circle Square.
- 3.94 The description of "canyon like streets" is provided as the primary character of the Whitworth Street conservation area. However, a more appropriate characterisation would be its red brick, historical buildings and long clear views along the streetscape.
- 3.95 City Centre Councillors commented that it is unclear if the statement describing the distinctive 'canyon street' quality of Whitworth Street is proposed to be replicated within North Campus. If this is the inference, it is felt that this would represent too dramatic a change within the SRF area.
- 3.96 To develop a neighbourhood, the vision should be led by residents as opposed to planners or architects. This should be taken into account as plans are progressed.
- 3.97 The Sackville building is not really part of the North Campus area and bears little in common with it aside from University ownership. Comparatively, the adjacent conference centre needs renewal and therefore attempts should be made to include it within the SRF area.
- 3.98 The overview of relevant national and local planning policies within the SRF is selective and incomplete, with no reference given to good design or appropriate consideration of the historic environment.
- 3.99 It would be appropriate that section 3.5 within the SRF considers the Northern Hub platforms at Piccadilly Station, given the impact this will have on Altrincham Street.

4.0 Historic England response

- 4.1 The principle of targeted regeneration and enhancement of North Campus is welcomed and is in line with the key outcomes of the SRF. Due to the site's location it has the potential to make an important contribution to the regeneration of the city centre.
- 4.2 The site contains a small part of the Whitworth Street/Princess Street Conservation Area, but is largely not designated as a conservation area in its own right.
- 4.3 In addition to the grade II listed Sackville building and Hollaway Wall, the former UMIST North Campus also has heritage significance as an undesignated heritage asset.

- 4.4 While architecturally mixed, certain elements of the site are of note. The most important is the Renold building; this part of the site has considerable merit in architectural design and urban planning. Historic England recommend that further consideration is given to the heritage significance of this within the Framework, together with the impact of proposed development on existing buildings and spaces.
- 4.5 Where there might be harmful impacts on the most distinctive elements of the site, Historic England recommend that, where possible, consideration is given as to how to avoid or mitigate this harm.
- 4.6 The sculptural wall appears to be in poor condition and has an unattractive setting. This might be improved if it was sited within a more enclosed location away from the road. This would allow the listed wall to be a more positive focal point, rather than a forgotten feature at the far end of the Campus, or lost within the architecture of a new building. Noting the proposals to enhance the setting of the listed Hollaway Wall, discussion with the Council's Urban Design and Conservation Team would be recommended.
- 4.7 Noting proposed alterations to the grade II Sackville building, early consultation with an urban design and conservation team on the impact of the proposed alterations and extensions would be recommended.

5.0 Response to consultation comments

Green space & public realm

- 5.1 The draft SRF proposals consulted on resulted in a very slight reduction in green space in the study area of 90m² from 2,330 to 2,240 m², but with an increased proportion of this considered to be more higher quality and usable space, as opposed to the current perimeter landscaping adjacent to the Mancunian Way, which lacks accessibility.
- 5.2 The requirement for amenity space has been a key issue in the consultation. In response to the specific comments and concerns relating to Vimto Park, the SRF has been revised to reinstate the entire length of the park from Sackville Street to Cobourg Street. The volume of the proposed building on Coburg Street that impinged on Vimto Gardens has been redistributed to the taller buildings to the south east of the site. This amendment now results in an overall increase in green space of all types across the study area. However, there will be a need to create an investment framework across the whole site to help deliver any additional amenity. This will be considered as part of detailed development proposals.
- 5.3 The SRF proposals maintain and extend the area's existing characteristic of smaller pocket parks / green spaces rather than a single larger space. It should be noted that the Council is working with partners to deliver a major new 6 acre city centre park as part of the Mayfield regeneration proposals. The Mayfield SRF area is adjacent to the North Campus area and will be easily accessible by those who live and work in the area.

- 5.4 Design principles which ensures the public realm is of a high quality, uses materials suitable for its purpose and is protected from potential vandalism are all fundamental components of the detailed design process, and will be considered at that time. This will also include a landscaping strategy that will set out details on existing trees, areas of planting and biodiversity within the SRF area.
- 5.5 The River Medlock is culverted directly below the Mancunian Way and its existing meandering course through the site was completely removed as part of the UMIST campus development in the 1960s. The reintroduction of the river was considered at an earlier stage in the creation of the SRF, but it was concluded that this would be impractical given the lower level of the river in comparison to ground level across the SRF site. Any lowering of ground level to account for the river would risk flooding implications. It could be possible to introduce water into the area as part of the detailed public realm design. However, this would likely be in the form of controlled areas of water rather than a river.
- 5.6 In reference to City Centre Councillors request for specific child friendly green space, this suggestion is noted and will be given consideration as detailed proposals are brought forward for the design of public realm areas within the North Campus site.

Heritage and existing buildings

- 5.7 The SRF takes a strategic view of the study area which is wholly within the University of Manchester's ownership. The Framework identifies issues and proposes possible solutions which demonstrate the potential of the area. It does not represent in itself a detailed design proposition. The SRF responds to its city centre context; adjacent development; the emergence of new city centre neighbourhoods at Mayfield and Circle Square; and the desire to improve access and connectivity across the south of the city centre, recognising that Piccadilly is likely to increase in importance as a gateway with the completion of planned rail infrastructure projects, and that Corridor Manchester is at the heart of health research and advanced manufacturing activity.
- 5.8 The scale of possible redevelopment on the North Campus site is indicated in order to set guidelines around which a detailed proposal would be framed.
- 5.9 The SRF recognises that the North Campus contains a number of non-listed existing buildings of medium significance which could have the potential for refurbishment and re-use. However, it is not within the scope of this study to carry out individual assessments of these buildings, and we would expect this assessment to be made as part of future detailed design proposals. This would be subject to the normal planning process as with any other development, as a scheme emerges.

- 5.10 While the SRF assessment remains appropriate, officers agree that it would be helpful to identify those existing buildings which may have the potential to be retained and refurbished, subject to final site designs, within a detailed development plan. These form some of the key 1960s UMIST buildings, including Renold, Pariser as well as Jackson's Mill. However, the viability and suitability of re-using these buildings will need to be fully tested at the detailed design stage. The SRF includes an assessment of the heritage significance of the site and categorises the heritage features accordingly. In the illustrative masterplan, the 'high significance' and listed elements are retained either with or without alteration, and two of the three medium significance buildings could be retained and re-used should this be appropriate at the detailed design stage.
- 5.11 The SRF proposals identify the need to create new pedestrian linkages between North Campus and Piccadilly/Mayfield across London Road. The SRF also recognises the status of the Hollaway Wall as a Grade II listed structure but identifies the barrier to strategic movement that it currently represents, particularly when the proposed viaduct widening along Altrincham Street is taken into consideration. A series of possible solutions are identified for the Hollaway Wall which would be further developed as part of any detailed proposals for the site. Before any physical change could be made to the Hollaway Wall, listed building consent would be required.
- 5.12 The SRF indicates the potential to reveal hidden courtyards within the Sackville building, however this is not expected to be a main route in to the site. It is anticipated that this could be facilitated by re-using or widening existing openings in the façade of the Sackville building at a low level. The illustrative drawing in the SRF has been altered to make this clear.
- 5.13 The Hans Tisdall Elements Mosaic has already been removed from the Faraday building, which was demolished for the construction of the Graphene Engineering Innovation Centre (GEIC). This has been preserved and will be installed as part of the delivery of the (GEIC) building. The Victor Pasmore mural features within the Renold Building, which as detailed within the SRF's heritage assessment holds unlisted status, but is considered of medium significance. This is one of the existing buildings which may be considered for re-use at the detailed design stage.
- 5.14 Jackson's Mill was severely damaged by fire, and is therefore considered to be of low significance, however like many of the other existing buildings on the site, any possible re-use will be considered at the detailed design stage.
- 5.15 Further dialogue will continue with Historic England as detailed designs are developed.
- 5.16 The majority of the SRF site sits outside of the Whitworth Street conservation area, however as indicated in the SRF, the area to the North of the railway viaduct is within the conservation area. This will be taken into account in the detailed development of the scheme, as the site comes forward for development. Any proposals which could impact on listed buildings and

structures will require the necessary consents before they could be implemented.

- 5.17 The sketches of buildings within the SRF are illustrative and are not indicative of design and materials, this would be consulted upon as part of a detailed planning submission.
- 5.18 The Hollaway Wall has been added to the diagram on page 34 of the SRF.

Proposed uses

- 5.19 In response to comments suggesting the provision of cultural facilities and amenities within the North Campus area, the neighbourhood will benefit from the collective world class cultural and leisure offer within the city centre. As connections to the area are enhanced, access to these facilities will be improved. The Council continues to work collaboratively with partners to ensure that city centre neighbourhoods have access to the amenities required to thrive as neighbourhoods of choice.
- 5.20 The location, adjacent neighbourhoods, accessibility, high quality connections and continued projected growth all suggest that both hotel provision and commercial units within the site can be supported. This will be further assessed as market demand evolves.
- 5.21 The existing sense of place is strongly identified with the current function of the site as an educational campus. The study recognises that this use is likely to change as the university's activity becomes more focused on the Oxford Road area. To find new occupiers, North Campus is likely to need to evolve to reflect its place in the growing centre of Manchester.
- 5.22 Given the site's location adjacent to the Corridor Manchester, and the campuses of the city's universities, the SRF outlines the potential for a mix of residential accommodation of which student accommodation could be a feature. The final mix of residential type would be a component of a detailed planning submission. The provision of student housing must be in line with the overall requirements of the universities.
- 5.23 The SRF takes a flexible view on identifying future uses and the detailed mix will be developed as the scheme comes forward for development after 2021. It is considered that new residential development on the site could complement current and proposed schemes at Mayfield and Piccadilly, and should consist of medium/high density city centre living, which could be in taller new buildings or refurbished existing buildings.
- 5.24 The SRF identifies a number of locations for potential residential use. The southern section of the site is felt to be less appropriate due to the noise and pollution from the elevated Mancunian Way.
- 5.25 The title deeds have verified that no covenant exists stipulating that the Sackville building can only be used for educational purposes.

Building heights

- 5.26 The building heights outlined within the SRF are indicative and will be subject to testing in terms of their relationship to heritage assets and 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 height in terms of new development.
- 5.27 As phases of development come forward the detailed planning applications will require sunlight and daylight assessments to understand and minimise potential adverse effects, carefully considering the effect of the proposals on existing residential buildings. It should, however, be noted that the density of development outlined is appropriate within the city centre context.
- 5.28 In relation to concerns that the building densities and heights will promote anti-social behaviour, this has not been demonstrated within other city centre developments.
- 5.29 The over-arching approach of the SRF is to enable the site to increase in density commensurate with the planned future growth of the city centre, and to do so whilst protecting the amenity of streets and spaces at ground level.
- 5.30 Taller buildings are placed on Sackville Street south of the railway viaduct as it is an important gateway location to the city centre. Well-designed tall buildings will support commercial, residential and education uses making efficient use of this important site close to Piccadilly Station.
- 5.31 The SRF seeks to preserve the character of North Campus through the approach to landscaping. When combined with the rail viaduct, Vimto Park, and the level changes across the site, alongside high-quality new buildings, the intention is that the area will remain a distinctive part of the city centre with a unique character.

The SRF document

- 5.32 As a strategic, rather than detailed planning document, the focus of the SRF is to articulate the issues, constraints and opportunities for the site, and set out high level development principles.
- 5.33 In response to a comment made on the title of the 'Strategic Regeneration Framework', this is consistent with a number of previously endorsed frameworks.
- 5.34 The University envisage that the SRF will support their goals through the creation of world class research facilities attributable to a proportion of the North Campus estate being used for research purposes. In addition there is scope, through the potential to provide student residential accommodation, to support a positive student experience.

- 5.35 Whilst the image on the second page of the SRF predates the Alan Gilbert Learning Commons on Oxford Road and Birley Fields Campus in Hulme, it is felt that this diagram still provides contextual value.
- 5.36 The annotation of the illustration included on page 43 of the SRF has been expanded.

The consultation process

- 5.37 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 applications are brought forward, residents and stakeholders will have the opportunity to comment on the detailed development plans.
- 5.38 The North Campus SRF was published as a draft. Comments received have been carefully considered and adjustments made to the SRF as a result of this consultation.
- 5.39 Consultation letters were issued on 3 January 2017, we became aware that Granby House residents had not received these by the weekend of the 7 January 2017 and subsequently hand delivered letters to all mailboxes on the 10 January 2017. In light of this 5 working day delay, we notified residents that we would accept consultation responses up until the date of the Executive.

Connectivity and sustainability

- 5.40 The SRF promotes sustainable modes of transport including cycling, walking and public transport, but also takes a realistic view on the future vehicular access and parking requirements of those living, working and visiting the area.
- 5.41 Various connectivity options were considered when developing the SRF, including direct linkages and paths across the whole site. However it was concluded that the use of streets and squares that followed existing city-centre layouts would best accommodate the needs of both pedestrians and cyclists whilst maintaining the dense urban character of the site.
- 5.42 The sustainability section of the SRF places North Campus in the context of the wider sustainability policies of the city. Further detail on sustainability will be a feature of detailed design proposals.
- 5.43 The image on page 59 illustrating 'existing grain' and 'new grain', has been amended to ensure that the correct colours are shown.
- 5.44 The proposed roads and shared-use areas are introduced to provide access and servicing to buildings only, the intention is not to create through-routes for

vehicular traffic. The SRF recognises the need to improve accessibility to the site to enable it to be better integrated into existing city centre development.

- 5.45 Connectivity between North Campus and the communities of the Grosvenor and Brunswick Estates was considered, however the infrastructure of the Mancunian Way impacted on this. To achieve a strong connection between these areas, a remodelling of the Mancunian Way would be required.
- 5.46 The SRF was created with the understanding that as new access and servicing routes are delivered, the crossings between Piccadilly and Fairfield Street will need to be developed to accommodate these.

General

- 5.47 The description used to characterise the Whitworth Street conservation area, of having "canyon like streets" refers to the relatively tall buildings along part of its frontage. It should be noted in response to the concerns of Councillors, that this statement is include as context for the Whitworth Street conservation area, and it is not the intention to replicate this within North Campus.
- 5.48 The impact of the viaduct-widening from the Northern Hub works, is considered within the SRF, as it will lead to a significant narrowing of Altrincham Street making it unsuitable as a vehicular access to the site. For clarity, this has been emphasised further in the final SRF. However, at the time of writing, it is unclear when the Piccadilly Northern Hub works are likely to commence. The outcome of the public inquiry is still unknown and no formal date has been set when this is likely to be determined.

6.0 Conclusions

- 6.1 North Campus is a key area of both the Corridor Manchester and the wider city centre possessing significant potential to contribute towards the regeneration and growth ambitions of the city.
- 6.2 Enhancements in connectivity are a critical component of the SRF. This prioritises improving pedestrian linkages and accessibility to both existing city centre districts and emerging neighbourhoods including Mayfield, and also to key public transport connections at Piccadilly Station.
- 6.3 The following revisions have been made to the final North Campus SRF:
- The SRF has been amended to detail the retention of the entire length of Vimto Park from Sackville Street to Cobourg Street. This amendment now ensures an overall increase in green space of all types within the North Campus area.
 - The SRF now indicates the existing buildings which may have the potential to be retained and refurbished.
 - The illustrative drawing of the Sackville building has been altered to better demonstrate the proposed intervention.

- The Hollaway Wall has been added to the diagram on page 34 of the SRF
- Further annotation to the illustration included on page 43 of the SRF has been made.

7.0 Key Polices and Considerations

(a) Equal Opportunities

- 7.1 A key aim of the Regeneration Framework is to ensure that local people can access and benefit from the employment opportunities and community facilities being created. In addition, the residential component of development demonstrates a commitment to ensuring the delivery of new high quality homes in close proximity to the region's economic hub, in line with demand.

(b) Risk Management

- 7.2 Not applicable

(c) Legal Considerations

- 7.3 If adopted by the Executive, the regeneration Framework will not form part of the Council's Development Plan but would be a material consideration when development control decisions are made.