

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Date of Appln</b>	<b>Committee Date</b>	<b>Ward</b>
116089/FO/2017	24th Jul 2017	8 Feb 2018	City Centre Ward

**Proposal** Construction of a 122 bedroom apartment hotel (Class C1) comprising a part 4, part 5, part 8 and part 13 storey building with basement, public realm and landscaping works. Demolition of existing buildings.

**Location** Land Bound By Back Turner Street, Soap Street, Shudehill & High Street, Manchester, M4 1EZ

**Applicant** Mr Simon Ismail, Tibst Limited, C/o Agent,

**Agent** Miss Ellie Philcox, Euan Kellie Property Solutions, Landmark House, Station Road, Cheadle Hulme, Cheadle, SK8 7BS,

## Introduction

Consideration of this application was deferred at the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on 16 November 2017 to enable a site visit to take place. The application was considered by the Planning and Highways Committee on 14 December 2017, following a site visit earlier in the day. The Committee resolved to defer the application to enable officers to have discussions with the applicant regarding a reduction in height of the Shudehill component of the scheme and to allow further negotiations regarding the waste management strategy.

At the meeting of the Committee on 11 January 2018, it was reported that following discussions the applicant had confirmed that they consider this to be an appropriate response to the site and had requested that the Committee determine the proposal as it stands. The Committee considered that the development was too high on the Shudehill frontage and that this would have a harmful effect on the setting of Shudehill. They resolved that they were minded to refuse the application on this basis and requested that a further report be presented setting out potential reasons for refusal.


Officers have considered carefully the Committee resolution and the potential reason for refusal, particularly in light of the view expressed by Historic England that they did not wish to comment on the proposal and consider the scale of the development on Shudehill is acceptable. However, should member's maintain the view that this impact is harmful, they may wish to consider the following as a potential reason for refusal.

The height of the building on Shudehill would have an unacceptable relationship to its context and would be overdominant in the streetscene. This would have a harmful effect on the Shudehill Conservation area.

## Background and context

The site is 0.16 hectares and occupies a prominent position at a gateway entry route into the City Centre. It is at the junction of Shudehill and Nicholas Croft, a key nodal

point where a number of different regeneration areas come together. It is directly opposite a major city centre transport interchange. The Northern Quarter is to the east and south, the retail area is to the south west, the Printworks and the Millennium Quarter is to the west and NOMA is to the north. It is within the Smithfield Conservation Area and adjacent to Shudehill Conservation Area. There are no listed buildings on the site, but there are several nearby including 75-77 High Street, 10-20 Thomas Street and the former Wholesale Fish Market on Thomas Street (all Grade II).




***Red Line Boundary of the Application Site***

The site is bounded by High Street, Back Turner Street, Nicholas Croft, Shudehill and Soap Street and contains the following buildings:

- 30-32 Shudehill - a one storey vacant shop unit;
- 1 Nicholas Croft - a one storey vacant shop unit;
- 3 Nicholas Croft - a one storey shop;
- 1 - 3 Back Turner Street - a five and six storey, derelict warehouse from the 1920s; and
- 5 Back Turner Street, a warehouse dating back to 1873 that is vacant and in very poor condition.

30-32 Shudehill and 1 Nicholas Croft were originally three and four storeys respectively but both had their upper stories removed after the Second World War.



**Existing Buildings**



**30-32 Shudehill**





**1-3 Nicholas Croft and 1-5 Back Turner Street**

The High Street frontage previously contained a five storey warehouse building, which was demolished in the 1980s. It is now a vacant gap site used informally as a car park.



**The Cleared Site bounded by  
Soap Street (right), High Street (centre) and Back Turner Street (left)**

On the opposite of Shudehill is a row of four storey, 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century buildings. Soap Street is narrow and contains the rear elevations of buildings on Thomas

Street, which have bar and restaurant uses on the ground floor with residential above. On the opposite side of High Street are four to five storey, traditional brick warehouses that have been converted to commercial and residential uses. Basil Chambers to the south and southwest, is a five to seven storey, stone and cast iron office building. Back Turner Street is used as a pedestrian route.

The seven storey Arndale Shopping Centre and multi-storey car park, and the Metrolink tramline is to the west. The Shudehill tram stop is directly opposite and, together the seven storey Shudehill bus and multi-storey car park forms, a multi-modal transport interchange.

The character of Shudehill and the character of the site does vary considerably. At Shudehill, the site is on a major gateway route into the City Centre and occupies a strategic nodal point where the retail core, NOMA and the Northern Quarter come together. Its character is formed by large structures such as the Arndale Centre, Printworks, the Co-op headquarters and the Shudehill Transport interchange. The High Street part is, however, part of the Northern Quarter where the overall grain is much finer comprising a grid of intersecting streets. The area has changed considerably over the past 25 years. It has seen major infrastructure projects such as the introduction of Metrolink and the Northern Quarter has also been transformed and now contains a significant amount of residential accommodation and is a popular restaurant and leisure destination.

## **The Proposal**

Planning Permission is sought to build an apart-hotel with 122 rooms (Class C1 Use) to be operated by Zoku, an Amsterdam based company and Manchester would be its first UK apart-hotel.

The concept is a hybrid between a home and an office and would be targeted at professionals coming to Manchester for stays of between five days and three months. A typical hotel room would focus around the kitchen table rather than the bed. Rooms would range in size from 24 to 32 sq.m, and each would have a living, kitchen and dining area, bathroom and a mezzanine bed space.

All existing buildings on site would be demolished and the new building would cover the entire site. It would include three distinct sections to respond to its immediate context. The three elements are:

- A lower, domestic scale element (four storeys and penthouse) facing Soap Street, High Street and Back Turner Street to relate to the scale and grain of High Street and the Northern Quarter in this location.
- A five and thirteen storey element facing Nicholas Croft and Shudehill; and
- An eight storey section between these two elements and opposite Basil Chambers on Back Turner Street. This would create a transition between the architectural character of Shudehill and that of the Northern Quarter.

The main entrance would be at the junction of Back Turner Street and Nicholas Croft and the ground floor would include front of house space and the hotel lobby. Meeting rooms would face onto Shudehill with a bar/restaurant onto High Street. Further back

of house space and toilets would be provided in the basement at lower ground floor level.

The twelfth floor would provide co-working space, management offices, a gym and plant space. The apartments would be located in the south side of the building overlooking High Street and Back Turner Street. The circulation space, stairs and lifts would be on the Soap Street frontage to reduce potential overlooking to residents who face onto Soap Street.

The height of the building to Shudehill has been reduced by around five metres. It would have strong vertical proportions and the main material would be brickwork. The building reduces to five storeys next to the Scuttler's Wine Bar and The Lower Turk's Head.

The central section would appear as an articulated curtain wall coloured black. This would respond to the scale of Basil Chambers on the opposite side of Back Turner Street and mark a clear division between the other two elements.

The lower High Street and Soap Street element would address the lower scale of the Northern Quarter. The fifth floor penthouse would be clad in the same brick-slip system as the tower, but in a buff/pale red and sandstone tone to complement Jewel House and buildings on High Street.

The proposed materials are intended to provide a contextual and contemporary response to the city centre context. A range of brick types would tie in with the deep reds and black, as well as more buff sandstone colours which are found in this part of the city centre.

Recessed windows would have black aluminium frames to match the predominantly glazed, central element of the building. With the exception of the ground floor, these would be largely opaque to minimise overlooking of apartments facing onto Soap Street and High Street.

Car parking would not be provided on site and guests could use nearby multi-storey car parks or existing pay and display on-street car parking near the site. 13 cycle parking would be provided in proposed bespoke cycle hoops with integrated lighting below the building overhang at the corner of Shudehill. This would be designed to match bespoke sculptural seating proposed at the junction of Nicholas Croft and Back Turner Street. The applicant is also looking to provide four staff cycle spaces in the basement of the building.

Significant improvements are proposed to Back Turner Street; including the widening of the northern footway to 2.75m, and a reduction of the carriageway to 3m with a 1.5m layby for drop off/pick up. It is proposed that the entire street would be surfaced in high quality materials, with a drop kerb delineating the carriageway and footway areas. Two Metrolink overhead line equipment poles would be removed from the pavement at Nicholas Croft and replaced with two eyebolt fixings on the new building.

Refuse vehicles and larger vehicles would predominantly use an existing loading bay on High Street with clean goods being delivered on rawing 063394-101 details the proposed strategy which allows for 'clean goods' to be delivered to Back Turner Street by vans or box vans.

The hotel would have a central recycling and refuse area within the building on the Soap Street frontage. All of the bins would be housed internally and would be brought out onto on collection day and wheeled 20 metres by members of a private collection team to the loading bay on the High Street. This process is to be carefully managed by the hotel. Guest access to the entrance would be level from Back Turner Street. The hotel would have an accessible room on floors one to seven and would comply with Part M of the Building Regulations.

The size of the bin stores have been calculated in order to comply with the City Council's 'Waste Storage and Collection Guidance for New Developments'. Four Refuse Euro Bins at 1,100 litres and one Paper Euro Bin at 1,100 litres would be provided within an internal refuse store and there would be no less than two collections per week. It is envisaged that the development as a whole would be serviced by a refuse collection contract with a third party.

General deliveries would take place from a loading bay on High Street. Clean goods such as linen, bar deliveries, packaged goods etc and, 'drop-off' and 'pick up' could take place from Back Turner Street.

### **Benefits of the Proposed Scheme**

The applicant considers that the proposal would deliver the following economic and social benefits:

It would help to further expand and diversify the supply of apart-hotel rooms within the City Centre, enabling the continued growth of the tourism industry and business sectors in Manchester.

It is anticipated that 80 direct full time equivalent (FTE) jobs could be created annually over the 70 week construction phase. This could include eight management and support staff and circa 70 construction staff. The hotel could generate 60 direct gross FTE jobs on-site when it is complete and occupied. An estimated 1,700 visitors per year could stay at the apart-hotel, based on an assumed average length of stay of seven nights and an average occupancy of 1.2 people per loft, generating visitor expenditure of £4.6 million per annum.

The application is supported by the following documents:

- Design & Access Statement prepared by 5plus Architects.
- Heritage Statement, including Visual Impact Assessment, prepared by Stephen Levrant Heritage Architecture.
- Desk Based Archaeological Assessment prepared by Archaeological Research Services Limited.
- Transport Assessment prepared by Curtins.
- Framework Travel Plan prepared by Curtins.

- Extended Phase 1 Ecology Survey prepared by Penny Anderson Associates.
- Air Quality Assessment prepared by Wardell Armstrong.
- Flood Risk Assessment prepared by CCS Consulting.
- Drainage Strategy prepared by CCS Consulting.
- Phase 1 Ground Investigation Assessment prepared by CCS Consulting.
- Noise Assessment prepared by dBx Acoustics.
- Crime Impact Statement prepared by Greater Manchester Police.
- Sustainability Statement prepared by Futureserv.
- Environmental Standards Statement prepared by Futureserv.
- Ventilation Strategy prepared by Futureserv.
- Daylight and Sunlight Assessment prepared by Gray Scanlan Hill.
- TV Reception Survey prepared by Astbury.

### **Land Interest**

The City Council has a land interest in part of the site and Members are reminded that in considering this matter, they are discharging their responsibility as Local Planning Authority and must disregard the City Council's land interest.

### **Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)**

An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Report was produced in advance of the application being submitted to determine which areas may have the potential to generate significant environmental effects. Based on the information provided, the City Council considered that an EIA was not required.

### **Consultations**

#### ***Publicity***

The occupiers of adjacent premises were notified and notices were placed next to the site boundary. The proposal was advertised in the Manchester Evening News as a major development, as affecting the setting of a conservation area and a listed building.

157 individual letters have been received. The material issues raised are summarised as follows.

- Objections to the proposed use.
- There are too many hotels and apart-hotels in the city centre and the area.
- The people using the proposed scheme would be short term, transient visitors.
- There would be stag and hen parties.
- The proposal is not independent and other uses such as affordable housing and a public park should be on the site.
- Detrimental effect on adjacent listed buildings, the character of the Northern Quarter and the conservation area.
- The existing buildings should be renovated, particularly 5 Back Turner Street.
- Inappropriate size and height of the proposed scheme.



- The appearance, material and colour.
- The architecture of the building.
- Concerns over negative impact on daylight, sunlight and overshadowing to residents of Jewel House and Market Buildings.
- Detrimental impact on local businesses such as This and That and the Lower Turks Head.
- Loss of advertising hoarding.
- Overlooking or loss of privacy to Jewel House and Basil Chambers.
- Means of access, parking, servicing, traffic generation and highway safety.
- Impact on bats which have been seen in the existing buildings in 2014.
- Crime prevention and community safety – there would be anti-social behaviour on Soap Street, High Street.
- The hotel would bring hen/stags, drunks, noise and late night disturbance which would further impact on local residents' amenity.
- Should move bin store to the roof level.
- Threat of asbestos and dust from the existing buildings.
- Strain on local drainage infrastructure.
- Renewable energy, sustainability of proposed development.
- Concerns about daily deliveries and refuse collection.
- The derelict buildings on Back Turner Street are rat infested which needs to be dealt with before demolition as it could cause a health hazard.

A resident of Jewel House has expressed disappointment with the recommendation which favours of visitors over long term residents. They do not consider that the daylight report is sufficient stating that nobody visited Jewel House and the report refers to various living spaces but the authors have not been inside flats.

Their objection to the substation location has not been acknowledged and they consider that the quietest component of the scheme would face non-residential accommodation.

Whilst the Shudehill side has been reduced, they were told by the architect that the building would not be reduced. They consider that long term residents who helped to shape the area are completely ignored and thought that the planning consultation process was designed to work collaboratively, which is why they made their concerns known early so they could be taken into consideration.

It is acknowledged that something to happen on site but not at this scale. The site has so much potential but the design is overbearing and mediocre.

Eight letters of support state that:

- This is a fantastic development in an area where I spend a lot of time.
- It is about time that someone did something with this particular site – it has been derelict for years.
- Zoku seem like a really exciting prospect for Manchester and a great fit for the area: there really isn't anywhere like it in the city.
- This site has been an eyesore for so many years and currently has an extremely negative impact on Shudehill / Back Turner Street / High Street.

- It will be great to see it redeveloped and replaced with such an exciting scheme.  
This is definitely the right location for taller buildings bearing in mind the new schemes that are coming forward in the northern part of the city centre.
- The close connection to Victoria Station and the Shudehill Transport Interchange will also make the hotel very accessible.
- The proposal would really improve the area, which at present is extremely run down and aesthetically unpleasant
- The designs submitted and the brand themselves appear to be fresh and innovative and I don't think there is anything else similar within Manchester.
- The proposed scheme has responded sensitively to the local site context, creating scale onto Shudehill that responds to the larger buildings around it such as Shudehill Interchange and the Crowne Plaza hotel, yet recognising the High Street environment needs a different response e.g; a reduced scale that compliments and enhances the unique built environment of neighbouring buildings.
- For years the High Street end of the site has been an ugly surface car park that attracts a range of anti-social behaviour, and this scheme will replace it with a building that has clearly been designed to complement the adjacent buildings either side.
- Whilst the neighbouring buildings on Shudehill may be 3-4 storeys and some may argue the proposed height is insensitive, the scale of the wider Shudehill/Victoria/MOMA environment is more reflective of the future of this part of the city centre which is establishing itself as a major commercial hub of the city.

## Consultations

**Highway Services** - No objection. Construction Management (including a dilapidation survey of footways and carriageways) and Travel Plan conditions are recommended. The proposal is likely to result in a low number of trips and is not considered to have any significant network capacity constraints.

**Environmental Health** - No objection. Recommends conditions covering deliveries servicing and collection, fumes, construction management, opening hours, noise, amplified sound, acoustic insulation, plant, storage of refuse, wheel washing, air quality and contaminated land.

**MCC Flood Risk Management** - No objection. Recommends two surface water drainage conditions.

**United Utilities Water PLC** - No objection. Recommends foul water and surface water conditions.

**Historic England (North West)** - No objection.

**Transport For Greater Manchester** - No objection. Recommends a Construction Management Plan Condition due to proximity to the operational tramway and that building fixings are looked at to replace two overhead line poles.

**Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service** - No objection. The recommendations in the Desk Based Assessment are acceptable. The warehouses should be recorded through a photographic and descriptive survey, with a watching brief undertaken during demolition to enhance the archive record as access is limited on health and safety grounds. The below-ground interest should be evaluated through archaeological trial trenching, and it is possible some trenches could be dug before demolition in the car park at the rear of the proposal site. It is likely that further trenching would be required following demolition. This may lead to a final phase of site work in the form of more detailed targeted excavation and recording. Recommends a condition requiring a Written Scheme of Investigation.

**Victorian Society** - Principle of site developing the site is welcomed. Objects to the proposed removal of existing buildings, particularly 5 Back Turner Street, and a new building of up to eighteen (sic) storeys in height. Any redevelopment should be of a scale and a nature that responds to the significance of the area and it should retain those elements of the site – particularly 5 Back Turner Street – that contribute to that significance.

**Flood Risk Management** - Recommended conditions regarding foul and surface water drainage, and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.

**Greater Manchester Ecology Unit** - No objection. Recommends Informatives covering bats and biodiversity enhancements.

**Corporate Property** – no comments received.

**Refuse and Sustainability** – no comments received.

**Travel Change Team** – no comments received.

**Strategic Development** – no comments received.

**Ward Councillors** – no comments received.

**Ancient Monuments Society** – no comments received.

**Twentieth Century Society** – no comments received.

**Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings** – no comments received.

**Council for British Archaeology** – no comments received.

**Georgian Society** - no comments received

**Greater Manchester Pedestrians Society** - no comments received.

**Wildlife Trust** - no comments received.

**The Historic Buildings and Conservation Areas Panel** - The Panel expressed its disappointment that the existing buildings had fallen into disrepair and was not being

retained and queried the analysis in the Heritage Assessment. They consider that the proposal has little to do with the character of the Northern Quarter and would be too tall. The tallest buildings in this block are five storeys, so a fourteen storey building would be out of place. The site is not a nodal point and is not suitable for a tall building.

They felt that the solution to High Street is a little unresolved and weak and suggested that there may be a more subtle way to deal with it and that the glass box to the rooftop appeared out of place. They would prefer to see a properly detailed extra storey and have concern about the relationship with the adjacent building and Turks Head.

They stated that the 'podium and tower' design is a vastly underused device and suggested that this approach would be more appropriate.

**Places Matter! Design Panel** – Comments were received on an earlier iteration of the proposal which has influenced the final form and revisions to the proposal.

Whilst the existing building does appear to be in a poor state of repair, the side elevations of the property show some quality and the applicant was encouraged to consider a more honest approach where there is remaining value.

The applicant was encouraged to draw out the conservation analysis in the context of the varying characters and different faces of the existing buildings and their surroundings. The listed building to Soap Street was considered an important part of the overall setting and this view captures the local character of the area.

The choice of a middle height solution to the new building was felt to be a compromise, because it would create too large a slab by spreading the mass back in to the site. The option to increase the height and reduce the mass of the building was felt worthy of consideration in terms of producing a more elegant solution.

The lower element of the proposal adjacent to the Turks Head was not felt to work. The applicant was encouraged to make this the same height as the adjacent buildings, whilst making this read more as part of the ground floor elements.

The turn in the road of Soap Street was felt to be a critical juncture in terms of the change in height of the proposed blocks. This should be used to clearly delineate the scale and create two separate masses. A glazed break at this point between the lower slab to the rear and the higher tower to Shudehill should be considered, as well as an additional entrance at this point that allows a continuous visual and actual connection through the building, in line with the rear elevation of the existing properties along to the Soap Street return to Thomas Street.

The proposed use was considered a good addition to this district of the city and the concept was felt to be very positive in terms of what it could contribute at street level. The applicant was urged to consider separate business addresses for each end of the building, as the proposal, as made, was not felt to be making the most of the grain of the Northern Quarter. A different language between the main tower and the

rear block should be introduced to make the transition to the Northern Quarter aesthetic.

A well-mannered end to the building at the Northern Quarter would be required. It was noted that once the existing height and ridge lines are broken, this would be considered as a 'tall' building whatever the final scale. The applicant was encouraged to be more confident in the design approach, which is currently too apologetic. The applicant was encouraged to seek a level of fenestration that articulates the frame through a simple pallet of materials and strengthens the window pattern in a manner more consistent with the character of the adjacent buildings in the Northern Quarter.

## ISSUES

### ***Relevant National Policy***

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to apply. It aims to promote sustainable development. The Government states that sustainable development has an economic role, a social role and an environmental role (paragraphs 6 & 7). Paragraphs 11, 12, 13 and 14 of the NPPF outline a "presumption in favour of sustainable development".

This means approving development, without delay, where it accords with the development plan. Paragraph 12 states that development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.

The proposed development is considered to be consistent with sections 1, 4, 7, 10, 11 and 12 of the NPPF for the reasons outlined below.

Section 1 - Building a strong and competitive economy – emphasises the Government's commitment to securing economic growth, and that significant weight should be placed on the need to support it through the planning system. In particular, it identifies the need for Local Planning Authorities to support existing business sectors, taking account of whether they are expanding or contracting and, where possible, identify and plan for new or emerging sectors likely to locate in their area.

The proposal would deliver 122 apart-hotel rooms in a highly sustainable location with easy access by foot to a range of services and facilities and has excellent access to all means of public transport. The scheme would create employment during construction along with permanent employment from the proposed offices and associated uses. It is estimated that approx. 80 FTE construction jobs and 60 permanent full time equivalent jobs could be created.

Section 4 Promoting Sustainable Transport - The proposal is in a highly accessible location next to Shudehill Metrolink stop and in close proximity to Victoria and Piccadilly railway stations and bus connections. The development would be sustainable and contribute to wider sustainability and health objectives and give people a real choice about how they travel.



Section 7 Requiring Good Design - The building would be high quality in terms of design, materials, appearance and its internal environment. It would be a high quality addition to the area and the city centre. The public realm would be of a high quality and would significantly contribute to the high quality of design in the area. The development would improve connections with local communities and be integrated into the natural and built environment.

Section 10 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change - The site is in a highly sustainable location. The Environmental Standards Statement submitted with the application demonstrates that the development would accord with a wide range of principles intended to promote the responsible development of energy efficient buildings integrating sustainable technologies from conception, through feasibility, design and build stages and also in operation.

The proposal would incorporate energy saving strategies to limit the use of energy. The development would accord with a wide range of principles intended to promote the responsible development of an energy efficient building integrating sustainable technologies from conception, through feasibility, design and build stages and also in operation.

Section 11 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment - Information submitted has considered the potential risk of various forms of pollution, including ground conditions, air and water quality, noise and vibration, waste and biodiversity and has demonstrated that the application proposals would not have any significant adverse impacts in respect of pollution.

Section 12 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment - The proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the setting of listed buildings or nearby conservation areas and this is discussed later in the report.

In the NPPF, Paragraph 128 advises that local planning authorities should require an applicant to submit sufficient information to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.

Paragraph 131 advises that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 132 advises that any harm to or loss of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm or loss should be exceptional and substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, including grade I and II\* listed buildings should be wholly exceptional.

Paragraph 133 advises that local planning authorities should refuse consent for proposals that would lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a

designated heritage asset, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. This is essentially a matter of judgement and would depend on the weight that is attached by decision makers and consultees to the various issues.

### **National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) (2014)**

The NPPG stresses the importance of good design and that planning should drive up standards. Plan makers and decision takers should always seek to ensure high quality design through creating places, buildings or space that work well for everyone, look good, last well and would adapt to the need of future generations.

### ***Relevant Local Policies***

#### The Development Plan

The Development Plan consists of:

- The Manchester Core Strategy (2012); and
- Saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995)

The Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012 -2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012. It is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. The Core Strategy replaces significant elements of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and sets out the long term strategic planning policies for Manchester's future development. The Core Strategy identifies Manchester City Centre would be the focus for economic and commercial development, retail, leisure and cultural activity, alongside high quality living.

A number of UDP policies have been saved until replaced by further development plan documents to accompany the Core Strategy. Planning applications in Manchester must be decided in accordance with the Core Strategy, saved UDP policies and other Local Development Documents as directed by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The NPPF requires application to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

#### Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (July 2012)

The relevant policies within the Core Strategy are as follows:

SO1. Spatial Principles - The development would be in a highly accessible location and reduce the need to travel by private car and therefore support the sustainable development of the City and help to halt climate change.

SO2. Economy - The scheme would provide new jobs during construction along with permanent employment and facilities in a highly accessible location. The development would provide housing near to employment opportunities and therefore

help to support the City's economic performance, reduce economic, environmental and social disparities, and help to create inclusive sustainable communities.

S05. Transport - The development would be highly accessible reducing the need to travel by private car and make the most effective use of public transport facilities. This would help to improve physical connectivity through the use of sustainable transport networks and help to enhance the functioning and competitiveness of the city and provide access to jobs, education, services, retail, leisure and recreation.

S06. Environment - The development would protect and enhance both the natural and built environment and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources in order to: mitigate and adapt to climate change; support biodiversity and wildlife; improve air, water and land quality; and, ensure that the City is inclusive and attractive to residents, workers, investors and visitors.

Policy SP 1 (Spatial Principles) - This sets out the key spatial principles which would guide the strategy. Development in all parts of the City should *"make a positive contribution to neighbourhoods of choice including: creating well designed places that enhance or create character; making a positive contribution to the health, safety and wellbeing of residents; considering the needs of all members of the community regardless of .....disability; and, protect and enhance the built and natural environment"*

The development would be highly sustainable and would deliver high quality apart-hotel accommodation alongside economic and commercial development within the City Centre. It would be close to sustainable transport provision, maximise the potential of the City's transport infrastructure and make a positive contribution to neighbourhoods of choice by: enhancing the built and natural environment; creating a well-designed place that would enhance and create character; re-using previously developed land; and reducing the need to travel.

Policy CC1 - Primary Economic Development Focus (City Centre and Fringe) - The proposed development would assist tourism and demonstrate confidence in the economic future of Manchester and the region.

Policy CC4 - Visitors, Tourist, Culture and Leisure - Hotels have become an increasingly important use across the City. Hotel development which contributes to the quality of the City Centre hotel offer would be supported. The proposed 122 bed apart-hotel would contribute positively towards meeting the objectives of Policy CC4.

Policy CC5 – Transport - The location of the proposal would contribute to improving air quality by being accessible to a variety of modes of sustainable transport.

Policy CC6 City Centre High Density Development – This is a high density proposal that would maximise the efficient use of land. The scale, massing and height of development is appropriate and would deliver a high density hotel and apart hotel scheme.

Policy CC7 Mixed Use Development – The proposal would diversify activity within the area and contribute to the provision of an appropriate mix of uses in the area.

Policy CC8 Change and Renewal – The development would contribute to the City Centre's role in terms of employment provision and improve the accessibility and

legibility. The impact of the proposal on the City's heritage and character is set out below.

Policy CC9 – Design and Heritage - A Heritage Statement provides an assessment of significance of the site and provides an impact assessment of the effect of the proposals on the setting of adjoining heritage assets and the character of the Conservation Area as a whole. The proposed scheme would have a high standard of design and materials appropriate to its context and the character of the area.

Policy CC10 – A Place for Everyone --Apartment-hotel rooms cater for different visitor types. The development would be fully inclusive with step-free access. All floors above ground level would be accessed via lift as well as stairs. The design has been developed to provide a simple and clear layout which is easy to use for all regardless of disability, age or gender.

Policy T1 - Sustainable Transport - The proposal would encourage a modal shift from car travel to more sustainable alternatives, and by redeveloping this redundant site, would improve key pedestrian routes.

Policy T2 - Accessible Areas of Opportunity and Need - The application is supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan Framework. The site is accessible by a range of sustainable public transport modes, including the Metrolink and bus services. The site is also within easy walking distance of the main railway stations in Manchester.

Policy EN1- Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas - The proposal involves a good quality design, and would result in development which would enhance the character of this area and the overall image of Manchester. The design responds positively at street level and would create a significant new building opposite the Shudehill transport interchange.

Policy EN2 – Tall Buildings - Tall buildings are defined as buildings which are substantially taller than their neighbourhoods and / or which significantly change the skyline. Proposals for tall buildings would be supported where it can be demonstrated that they:

- are of excellent design quality;
- are appropriately located;
- contribute positively to sustainability;
- contribute positively to place making, for example as a landmark, by terminating a view, or by signposting a facility of significance; and
- would bring significant regeneration benefits.

A fundamental design objective is to ensure that tall buildings complement the City's key existing building assets and make a positive contribution to the evolution of a unique, attractive and distinctive Manchester, including its skyline and approach views. Suitable locations include sites within and immediately adjacent, to the City Centre, with particular encouragement given to non-conservation areas and sites which can easily be served by public transport nodes.

The proposed scheme is of a high quality design and proposes a tall building which is appropriately located in relation to the Shudehill Transport interchange. The proposal provides an opportunity to regenerate a brownfield site with a high quality scheme in a key location, positively contributing to place making.

The Environmental Standards Statement states that the site is well located in relation to a range of sustainable modes of transport, and that the proposal would adopt sustainable methods of design and construction and would incorporate energy saving strategies to limit the use of energy.

Overall, the proposed development would positively contribute and support the aims of the Core Strategy policy on Tall Buildings and is in full accordance Policy EN2.

Policy EN3 Heritage – The development would support the Council in preserving or enhancing the historic environment, the character, setting and accessibility of areas of acknowledged importance. This is discussed in more detail below.

Policy EN4 Reducing CO2 Emissions by Enabling Low and Zero Carbon Development – The development would follow the principle of the Energy Hierarchy to reduce the need for energy through design features that provide passive heating, natural lighting and cooling, that use efficient features such as improved insulation and glazing and meet residual energy requirements through the use of low or zero carbon energy generating technologies

Policy EN6 Target Framework for CO2 reductions from low or zero carbon energy supplies – Applications for all development over 1,000 sq. m. would be expected as a minimum to meet the targets set out in this policy, unless this can be shown to be not viable. This should be demonstrated through an energy statement. The energy statement would be expected to set out the projected regulated energy demand and associated CO2 emissions for all phases of the development

Policy EN14 Flood Risk - In line with the risk-based sequential approach contained within PPS25, development should be directed away from sites at the greatest risk of flooding, and towards sites with little or no risk of flooding; this should take account of all sources of flooding identified in the Manchester-Salford-Trafford Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).

Policy EN16 - Air Quality - The proposal would be highly accessible by all forms of public transport and reduce reliance on cars and therefore minimise emissions from traffic generated by the development.

Policy EN17- Water Quality - The development would not have an adverse impact on water quality. Surface water run-off and grounds water contamination would be minimised.

Policy EN18 - Contaminated Land and Ground Stability - A desk study which considers ground contamination issues has been submitted with the application.

Policy EN19 Waste - The development would be consistent with the principles of waste hierarchy. In addition the application is accompanied by two Waste



Management Strategies which detail measures that would be undertaken to minimise the production of waste both during construction and operation.

Policy DM1 Development Management - This sets out the requirements for developments in terms of BREEAM and outlines a range of general issues that all development should have regard to. Of these, the following issues are or relevance to this proposal:

- Appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials and detail;
- Design for health;
- Adequacy of internal accommodation and amenity space;
- Impact on the surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development;
- That development should have regard to the character of the surrounding area;
- Effects on amenity, including privacy, light, noise, vibration, air quality and road safety and traffic generation;
- Accessibility to buildings, neighbourhoods and sustainable transport modes;
- Impact on safety, crime prevention and health; adequacy of internal accommodation, external amenity space, refuse storage and collection, vehicular access and car parking; and
- Impact on biodiversity, landscape, archaeological or built heritage, green Infrastructure and flood risk and drainage.

These issues are considered full, later in this report.

#### Saved UDP Policies

The following saved UDP policies need to be considered in relation to the application.

Policy DC17.1. Telecommunications – This places restrictions on telecommunications equipment.

Policy DC18.1. Conservation Areas. - The impact of the development on the development is within the Smithfield Conservation Area is set out below.

Policy DC19.1 Listed Buildings - There are no listed buildings within the application site, but the development would affect the setting of a number of listed buildings and this is addressed below.

Policy DC20.1 Archaeology - An archaeological desk based assessment has been carried out for the site. It is considered that a Written Scheme of Investigation should be carried out.

Policy DC26.1 Development and Noise - This details how the development management process would be used to reduce the impact of noise on people living and working in the City and which states that this would include consideration of the impact that development proposals which are likely to be generators of noise would have on amenity, and the implications of new development being exposed to existing noise sources.

Policy DC26.2 Development and Noise – New noise-sensitive developments including large-scale buildings, such as housing, would be permitted subject to their not being in locations which would expose them to high noise levels from existing uses or operations, unless the effects of the noise can be realistically reduced.

Policy DC26.4 Development and Noise – Where existing noise sources might result in an adverse impact upon a proposed new development, the Council would require the applicant to provide an assessment of the likely impact and the measures proposed to satisfactorily deal with it.

Policy DC26.5 Development and Noise - This states that the Council would control noise levels by requiring, where necessary, high levels of noise insulation in new development, as well as noise barriers where this is appropriate.

### **Relevant National Policy**

#### ***Other Relevant Guidance***

#### **Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance (April 2007)**

Part 1 of the SPD sets out the design principles and standards that the City Council expects new development to achieve, i.e. high quality developments that are safe, secure and accessible to all.

The SPD states that proposals should seek to ensure that the use of the building reflects their purpose and the place in which they are located. Development should enliven and define neighbourhoods and promote a sense of place. Development should have regard for the location of sustainable public transport and its proximity.

It goes on to state that developments that remain flexible and allow for new users and functions to take over would be supported. Internal space within buildings should be designed such that it retains a long-term flexibility for adaptation for use by future users. The conversion of existing buildings for a range of new uses is encouraged, ensuring that proposals are fully accessible for disabled people.

In relation to crime issues, the SPD requires that prevention measures should be demonstrated, and include the promotion of informal surveillance, CCTV, good lighting and s stewardship.

The proposed uses, and the design of the proposed scheme, would ensure flexibility in providing differing activities would be fully compatible with the Guide.

#### **Stronger Together: Greater Manchester Strategy 2013 (GM Strategy)**

The Sustainable Community Strategy for the Greater Manchester City Region was prepared in 2009 as a response to the Manchester Independent Economic Review (MIER). MIER identified Manchester as the best placed city outside London to increase its long term growth rate based on its size and productive potential.

It sets out a vision for Greater Manchester where by 2020, the City Region would have pioneered a new model for sustainable economic growth based around a more connected, talented and greener City Region, where all its residents are able to contribute to and benefit from sustained prosperity and a high quality of life.

### **City Centre Strategic Plan (2015-2018)**

The City Centre Strategic Plan was endorsed by Manchester City Council in 2016. It provides an update on what has been achieved since the 2009-2012 Plan. It updates the vision for the city centre, direction of travel and key priorities and the partnerships in place to deliver those priorities.

#### ***Northern Quarter***

The Plan identified the application site as being in the Northern Quarter. The following priorities are outlined:

- Building on the successes of the area's evening economy by promoting usage as a day time destination.
- Marketing and promotion of the area to encourage a greater variety of people to visit and move through the area and to encourage new and more diversified investment.

### **Greater Manchester Destination Management Plan: The Visitor Economy Action Plan (2014 – 2017)**

This plan identifies, as a key action, the need to support opportunities to develop the range and volume of visitor products and services, including new hotel developments in order to meet the Plans wider objectives of increasing staying visitor numbers from 9.6m to 10.6m and improve the economic impact of business tourism to Greater Manchester.

Tourism is a critical part of the economy for the Greater Manchester city region. Recent estimates indicate that tourism in Greater Manchester generates in the order of £6.6 billion a year for the local economy and supports nearly 84,000 full time jobs.

The growth of tourism has been underpinned by new developments in the conurbation including sporting facilities (e.g. Sportcity and the redeveloped Emirates Old Trafford), cultural attractions (e.g. HOME, the National Football Museum, the People's History Museum and the Imperial War Museum), a thriving media sector (e.g. MEDIACITYUK) and improvements in the City Centre's retail offer (Manchester Arndale is now the UK's largest inner city shopping mall), which have all strengthened Manchester's reputation. The growth of tourism in the city is reflected in that Manchester Airport is now considered the 20th busiest airport in Europe.

### **Legislative requirements**

Section 16 (2) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the "Listed Building Act") provides that "in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works to a listed building, the local planning authority or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses"

Section 66 of the Listed Building Act 1990 provides that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development that affects a listed building or its setting the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72 of the Listed Building Act 1990 provides that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development that affects the setting or character of a conservation area the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

Development decisions should also accord with the requirements of Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which notes that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and emphasises that they should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Of particular relevance to the consideration of this application are sections 132, 133 and 134.

Section 149 Equality Act 2010 provides that in the exercise of all its functions the Council must have regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between person who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not. This includes taking steps to minimise disadvantages suffered by persons sharing a protect characteristic and to encourage that group to participate in public life. Disability is a protected characteristic.

Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act 1998 provides that in the exercise of its planning functions the Council shall have regard to the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder.

## **CONSERVATION AREA DECLARATION**

### **Smithfield Conservation Area**

Smithfield conservation area lies on the north-eastern edge of the city centre. The area is bounded by Swan Street, Oldham Street (a common boundary with the Stevenson Square Conservation Area), Market Street, High Street and Shudehill (a common boundary with the Shudehill Conservation area).

The south-west part of the Conservation Area is composed of large buildings, and any new development here is likely to be designed on a substantial scale. Conversely, the remainder of the Conservation Area is composed of relatively small buildings of one to four storeys, and new proposals here would need to be scaled appropriately.

The small scale of the older 18th century buildings is especially noticeable around Turner Street, Back Turner Street and Thomas Street. They represent the remains of the buildings originally constructed on greenfield sites. These streets and the buildings defining them create a rich tapestry of spaces and built form located hard up to the back of pavement. One of the aims of improvement would be to restore this characteristic where it has been eroded.

A number of sites have been left vacant where buildings have been demolished. Many of these are used as temporary car parks, which detract from the visual appeal of the area. Most of these sites should be developed with buildings which contribute to the character of the conservation area. A mix of uses would be appropriate, with housing being especially welcome.

It is important that the narrow-fronted character of the older buildings is retained in any new development. This would ensure a vertical rhythm in the 'street wall' when viewed in perspective. The height, scale, colour, form, massing and materials of new buildings should relate to the existing high quality buildings and also complement their character.

Both the larger and smaller buildings within the conservation area exhibit a great variety in style, but also a common unity which designers of new and refurbished buildings should acknowledge. However, superficial copies of historic buildings do not make a positive contribution to the historic character of the area. Each building should have a vitality of its own.

Designers should be aware of proportion and rhythm in their buildings and also differentiate a ground floor, middle portion (where there is sufficient height to do so) and a top part which creates a varied skyline, in order to enhance the area.

Although there is great variety in building materials used in Smithfield, such as brick, stone and stucco, brick with stone dressings predominates. These solid, traditional materials should be used in preference to large expanses of cladding, concrete and glass.

The corner emphasis characteristic of Manchester buildings is evident in Smithfield, and its use in new developments would therefore be encouraged. Signs and canopies should be carefully designed so as not to compete with or cancel the architectural details of buildings.

Existing buildings in the south of the area tend to be larger in scale than those in the other parts of the Conservation Area. New buildings in Piccadilly, Market Street, Church Street and the southern parts of High Street and Oldham Street should relate to their immediate neighbours which are up to seven storeys high. Elsewhere in the area existing developments tend to be lower, rarely exceeding four storeys.

The main criterion in urban design terms in this area is about fitting into an established street pattern with the scale of development proportions and materials of major concern. Quality is the overriding aim in any new proposal, and this can be provided in either sensitive refurbishment of existing buildings or the appropriate design of new buildings.



In line with other parts of the city centre, new development proposals should generally be aligned to the back of pavement, in order to preserve the linear character of the streets.

### **Principle of the Proposed Use and the Scheme' Contribution to Regeneration**

Regeneration is an important planning consideration. Over the past twenty years, the City Council has successfully regenerated major parts of the City Centre such as Piccadilly, Spinningfields, the commercial core, The Corridor, Manchester, the Northern Quarter, First Street, the Civic Quarter, NOMA and Castlefield. This is an ongoing process and much remains to be done if the City Centre is to remain competitive.

The City Centre is the primary economic driver in the Region and is crucial to its longer term economic success. It is essential therefore that the City Centre continues to grow and provide new homes and new commercial accommodation in order to deliver regeneration.

Shudehill is a major gateway entry route into the City Centre. Whilst it has seen some change over the past 25 years, particularly at the western end around the Printworks and the Arndale Centre, there is still a considerable amount of work required to improve its appearance and function. The streetscape at the eastern end is fragmented, disjointed and gives a poor first impression of the City to those arriving from the north along Rochdale Road and other radial routes. It is also the first impression of the city centre to many arriving by bus or tram at the Shudehill interchange. There are a number of older buildings along the street, some of which have been successfully refurbished and which contribute to its character, but there are also sites that create an air of dereliction that need to be redeveloped or improved.

Shudehill is an important route in the City Centre bordering the retail core, NOMA and the Northern Quarter. It is important to ensure that it provides a high quality appearance in order to support much needed regeneration in those areas and the broader city centre. This is a prominent site which currently has a negative impact on the area being partly derelict and partly vacant. The proposed aparthotel would develop the site and help to drive forward growth and promote regeneration.

The aparthotel would complement the City Centre hotel offer, in accordance with Core Strategy CC4. It would be operated by an independent, high-quality and unique brand and would bring benefits to Manchester's hotel market and to the local area. The concept of the aparthotel is a hybrid between a home and an office and would broaden the hotel offer. There is a confirmed end user who is fully committed to this site, which would ensure that the scheme is viable and deliverable.

The scheme would regenerate and bring into productive use a site which has been partly vacant for over 30 years. It would improve its physical appearance and provide a new building of high architectural quality. The proposal would create approximately 80 construction jobs and 60 permanent jobs, with priority given to members of the local community. This would include a mix of full and part-time positions and the proposal would also lead to job creation during the construction phase.

## **Tall Buildings**

### **Design Issues / Impact on Townscape - Historic England Guidance on Tall Buildings**

The Manchester Guide to Development SPD states that *“it would always be important for the City to be able to accommodate new interest and activity in its different forms, including tall buildings”* and the City Council *“would require any such proposals to be presented in context of the joint guidance produced by CABE and English Heritage (now Historic England) for assessing tall buildings”*. The proposed thirteen storey element facing onto Nicholas Croft and Shudehill, is considered to be a tall building in its context. It has been assessed against Core Strategy Policy EN2 on Tall Buildings and the criteria as set out in the Guidance on Tall Buildings Document published by English Heritage and CABE.

Historic England's Advice Note 4, 2015 updated the CABE and English Heritage Guidance published in 2007, responding to the National Planning Policy Framework and the increase in proposals for new tall buildings. It identifies a series of steps that should be undertaken at pre-application for tall buildings which are addressed in the information submitted in support of the application.

The application is supported by a Heritage Statement and Visual Impact Assessment, a Design and Access Statement (DAS), Planning Addendum Document and Planning Statement. The Heritage Statement identifies key views and assesses the potential impacts in a Visual Impact Assessment. It also evaluates the proposed building's relationship to its context. These impacts are discussed in more detail below.

The DAS provides a thorough understanding of the site context and details of the proposal. The Planning Statement includes a Justification Statement in relation to policies within the NPPF and Core Strategy.

### **Assessment of Context**

The effect of the proposal in terms of scale, height, urban grain, streetscape and built form, key views and effects on the skyline are important considerations. As well as being on a gateway route and at a key nodal junction, the apart-hotel would be in the Smithfield Conservation Area, next to the Shudehill Conservation Area and near to a number of Grade II listed buildings. The development has to respond successfully to this challenging and changing context.

The site is irregular in shape, narrow and approx. 70 metres long. The urban context and character at Shudehill differs to that at High Street. High Street is clearly part of the traditional Northern Quarter where there are tightly grained, former warehouses. At Shudehill the character changes with the Metrolink tramlines and large, modern structures such as the Arndale Centre, Printworks, Shudehill transport interchange and the Co-op headquarters.




**Figure Ground Plan: Application Site and Different Character Areas/Urban Grain**


The building has been reduced in height by five metres since it was first submitted. The number of apartments has reduced from 129 to 122, with a storey removed from the tower element and each floor reduced in height by 150mm. This results in a scheme of 13 storeys facing onto Shudehill and four storeys and penthouse to High Street. The penthouse at fifth floor level has been reduced in height to relate to the adjacent roofscapes at Soap Street and High Street. It would be below the ridge line of these properties.

At High Street, adjacent to Jewel House, the proposal is entirely within the historic envelope of the building that previously occupied the site. The middle section is marginally above the parapet line of the existing structures on the site and is set back 1.5 metres from the existing back of pavement and the footprint of the existing building on the site.

The tower element is in a key location in relation to the Northern Quarter, Shudehill and the Retail Core and needs to relate to each. There are a number of taller buildings and proposals in the immediate vicinity including the Shudehill Interchange (seven storeys), the CIS Tower (26 storeys), One Angel Gardens (35 storeys under construction) and Skyline Central (18 storeys). Below is a view of the proposal in its context as seen from Piccadilly Gardens and Market Street/High Street.



***View Northwest from Piccadilly Station***



***View Northwest up High Street from Market Street***

It is considered that the 13 storey tower element would be consistent with other taller buildings that have been approved or built in the Smithfield Conservation Area. This includes the following:

- The Light Apartments (20 storeys);
- Red Lion Street (part 11 storeys, planning consent in place);
- Tib Street (9-10 storeys, under construction);
- One Smithfield Square (10 storeys);
- Holiday Inn Express (10 storeys) and;
- Crowne Plaza (nine - 10 storeys).

These buildings are all located along the western and northern edges of the Conservation Area.

The tower would mark a key nodal point within the wider townscape and mark the transition between the larger urban grain to the north and west and the tighter urban grain to the south. It would function as a high quality gateway into the Northern Quarter and the retail core from the north-west and from these areas to NOMA. Its

visibility from the eastern end of Market Street would assist legibility, orientation and movement within a wide area.

The scale is reduced to five storeys on Shudehill next to The Lower Turk's Head and Scuttler's Wine Bar to provide a well-considered, glazed transition between the new building and the old.

### **Historic Environment**

#### **Heritage Significance of Existing Buildings and Cleared Site**

A Heritage Statement has assessed the buildings and the interiors have been inspected and surveyed. The buildings on the site have been assessed as follows.

30-32 Shudehill - this building was originally three storeys and had its upper floors removed between 1939 and 1962. These demolition works removed the majority of the early building fabric, with the remaining ground floor shop front being extensively remodelled and renewed throughout the 20th/21st centuries. There is no significant historic fabric left.

The rear of the buildings have been altered and have suffered from catastrophic collapse due to substantial water ingress through the flat roofs.

The building has no aesthetic, historical, evidential or communal value and is considered to be of no architectural or historic significance. It is considered to be a negative element within the streetscape and indeed the character and appearance of the Smithfield Conservation Area.





**30 - 32 Shudehill**



***The collapsed rear of 30 - 32 Shudehill***

1 - 3 Nicholas Croft - this building was originally three storeys but its upper floors were removed between 1939 and 1962 removing the majority of the building fabric. The remaining ground floor shop front has been extensively remodelled and renewed throughout the 20th/21st centuries. There is no significant historic fabric left.

The building has no aesthetic, historical, evidential or communal value and is considered to be of no architectural or historic significance. It is considered to be a negative element within the streetscape and on the character and appearance of the Smithfield Conservation Area.





### **1 - 3 Nicholas Croft**

1 - 3 Back Turner Street - this building was constructed in 1916 as an extension to the adjoining boot and shoe warehouse at 5 Back Turner Street. It is designed in an earlier, Edwardian style, with some areas of simple architectural detailing. The building is constructed using a reinforced concrete frame with concrete floors and stairs.

The principal elevation on Back Turner Street is the only elevation to have any architectural detailing. It has areas of simple, glazed, buff terracotta moulded detailing but has lost all original windows and doors. The side and back elevations are utilitarian in material, craftsmanship, detailing and design.

The inside originally had open-plan floors with a hoist and staircase onto Soap Street. There has been over 20 years of water ingress, and the structure is now severely deteriorated on the upper floors. There is extensive failure of the concrete super-structure throughout, exposing the steel skeleton in places which is severely corroded.

The internal floors retain no significant historic fabric nor architectural features except for a small area of original brown wall tiling to the entrance. This is partly because the building was built as a simple boot warehouse and because substantial internal reordering and reconstruction took place during the 1990s. The floorplan has been subdivided and altered at every level and any remaining historic elements have been removed. Internal walls have been replaced with modern plastered stud walls and original brick external walls were plastered/skimmed.

The building has low aesthetic, historical, evidential or communal value and is considered to be of low architectural and historic significance.



### **1 - 3 Back Turner Street**

5 Back Turner Street - this building was constructed in 1873 by Alley & Wilson Architects as a pair of identical warehouses for J. B. Filmer. The buildings were first used as boot and shoe warehouses by J. & E. Smith in 1873, who had moved from the building next door at No. 1 Nicholas Croft. Externally the building retains no historic windows or doors, and the southern elevation is blank.



The building has been derelict for approximately 20 years. It is currently in a dangerous state of repair with views of the inside only visible through the party wall openings from No. 1 & 3 from some floor levels. It is unsafe to enter, however from views gained from the adjoining property, the building can clearly be seen to have suffered from catastrophic floor collapses at every level. This is due to prolonged water ingress.

Where the interiors are visible it is clear that the original staircase has been replaced and internal cross walls have been removed. Due to internal reconstruction during the 1990s, only parts of the original timber floors survive. Where they do, they are suffering from considerable and sizable collapse/rot. No features of historic significance were noted as surviving.

As a typical building of this date the building yields low aesthetic, historical, evidential or communal value and is considered to be of low architectural and historic significance.



**5 Back Turner Street**

Cleared site bounded by Soap Street, High Street and Back Turner Street - this site was cleared during the early 1980s. It has no historic fabric, and consequently yields no aesthetic, historical, evidential or communal values. It is considered to be a negative element within the streetscape and indeed the character and appearance of the Smithfield Conservation Area.

### **Summary**

The appraisal of the historic development and architectural interest of the buildings has demonstrated that they are of low to no architectural or historic interest. None of the buildings are statutorily listed. The site, as a whole, has a negative impact upon the character and appearance of the Smithfield Conservation Area.

## **Structural Survey**

A Structural Report was undertaken following a visual structural survey and provides a general overview of the structural condition of the buildings on the site, draws attention to significant structural defects and items of disrepair, and provides a number of recommendations.

The survey concludes the following in relation to each building:

No. 30 and 32 Shudehill and No. 1 and 3 Nicholas Croft – the building is in a poor state of repair. The areas of collapsed and unstable roofing should be made safe with either demolition or temporary works. Use of areas within occupied units adjacent to the collapsed and unstable roof should be restricted until the making safe works have been implemented.

No. 1 and 3 Back Turner Street – the building is in a poor state of repair. A number of emergency works should be undertaken to prevent further deterioration and avoid short and medium term structural stability issues. If retention and refurbishment is to be considered following the implementation of the emergency works, then an extensive programme of works is recommended to be undertaken subject to detailing investigation works.

No. 5 Back Turner Street - the building is in a very poor state of repair and without emergency works is at risk of further localised collapse of the floors, which could result in sections of façade becoming unstable and progressive collapse. To prevent further deterioration and avoid short term structural stability issues, a number of emergency works are recommended to be undertaken. The future viability of the building for re-use is questionable as many elements are beyond serviceable use and would require wholesale replacement.

It can be concluded that the existing buildings on the site are of low to no architectural or historic interest and are also largely structurally unstable. The proposed demolition of these buildings is therefore justified in the context of Core Strategy Policy EN3 and Section 11 of the NPPF.


## **Visual Impact Assessment**

A Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) has assessed where the proposal would be visible from and assesses the visual impact on the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings. The assessment uses the guidance and evaluation criteria set out in Historic England's *"Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets"* (2015). It adapts the methodology outlined in their document, *"Seeing the History in the View: A Method for Assessing Heritage Significance within Views"* (May 2011).

Four verified views were agreed with the City Council to assess the visual impact the proposal scheme in heritage terms. These are:

- Viewpoint 1: Looking East from Withy Grove;
- Viewpoint 2: Looking South East from Shudehill;

- Viewpoint 3: Looking North East from High Street; and
- Viewpoint 4: Looking North West from High Street.



### **Verified Views**

The potential effects have been assessed through a combination of desk study research and walkover surveys of the site and the surrounding area. The Assessment provides a comparison from key viewpoints of the potential visual impact on the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings to evaluate the baseline impact and the comparative visual impact that would result from the proposal, focusing on the identified heritage assets.

Viewpoint 1 is from the junction of Withy Grove, Shudehill and Nicholas Croft, looking east towards the site. The view is dominated by buildings that run along the back of pavement line. The single storey units in the application site are largely in poor condition. This sense of dereliction has fragmented an otherwise solid street wall.

This view demonstrates the key nodal point of the application site as a gateway into the Northern Quarter and a view into the Smithfield Conservation Area. The narrow-fronted buildings, to the north-east of the application site, illustrate the historic character and appearance of the conservation area. The application site appears as a negative contributor to the character and appearance of the area. As a local view looking into the conservation area the combined value and importance of the heritage assets and the view as a whole is low-to-medium.



***Viewpoint 1: From the junction of Withy Grove, Shudehill and Nicholas Croft, looking east towards the site.***

The proposal would transform this view and provide a landmark building on a prominent site, opposite the Shudehill transport interchange. It would be taller than



the adjacent buildings but the vertical articulation and the use of brick work would relate to the narrow-fronted buildings to the north-east.

Kinetic views provide the wider context of the view which includes the Shudehill interchange and Arndale Shopping Centre and Car Park and demonstrate how the building responds to the wider area, and marks this gateway into the Northern Quarter. The views discussed below, illustrate that the stepped nature of the building responds to the tighter urban grain and building height within the Smithfield Conservation Area. The proposal would transform a site that makes a negative contribution to the Conservation Area and the overall impact of the proposal would be minor beneficial.

Viewpoint 2 is from the north side of Shudehill, looking south towards the application site. The view is enclosed with buildings along each side of the street at back of pavement line. It illustrates the fragmented nature of the streetscape as a whole, with a gap site to the north of the Grade II listed Hare and Hounds pub which fragments the sense of enclosure. There are a variety of building types, heights, forms, materiality and uses which do not present any coherent character. Although this view contains the Grade II listed Hare and Hounds pub, it is not considered to represent any particular heritage values. Consequently, as the combined value and importance of the heritage assets and the view as a whole is low.

The height, form and massing of the proposal sits comfortably within the streetscape strengthening the sense of enclosure. Whilst the palette of materials is varied within this view, the colour of the red brick cladding would relate to the orange-red hues of the brickwork used on the historic buildings seen within this view. The proposal would enhance the sense of cohesion to this local view and the character of the conservation area. The overall impact would be minor beneficial.



***Viewpoint 2: From the north side of Shudehill, looking south towards the application site***

Viewpoint 3 is from the junction of Back Turner Street and High Street, looking north towards the application site. The view is dominated by the cleared on High Street. There is a real sense of dereliction created by the condition of the vacant buildings on the site and this has a negative impact on the character and appearance of the streetscape and the setting of the Grade II listed 75-77 High Street. There is a lack of enclosure within the conservation area and the lack of activity weakens the otherwise cohesive nature of the conservation area. The combined value and importance of the heritage assets and the view as a whole is low-to-medium.

It is considered that the height, form and massing of the proposal at High Street responds directly to the historic buildings either side of it and reinstates the urban form in this location. The curved corner is a direct response to the historic approach to a corner entrance/ emphasis, which is seen throughout the area. This would encourage movement and exploration through the space, which has until now been underused and a negative contributor to the character of the area.

The use of red brick would relate to the materials used in the area and would help to ensure that the building sits comfortably within its context. It is considered that the proposed scheme would enhance the sense of cohesion in this view and the character of the conservation area. Consequently, the overall impact of the proposed scheme would be minor beneficial.





***Viewpoint 3: from the junction of Back Turner Street and High Street, looking north towards the application site***

Viewpoint 4 is from High Street at the junction with Nicholas Croft, looking north-east. The cleared site, is still understood as a negative element, which fragments the sense of enclosure and urban form. The architectural form and expression of the Grade II listed 75-77 High Street building, and former Fish Market buildings are visible in this view, as is the significance of their setting within the streetscape. As a locally important view of these heritage assets, the combined value and importance of the heritage assets and the view as a whole is medium.

The proposal would complete the street wall enhancing the sense of enclosure within this view. The form, height, massing and articulation of the proposal, within this view, is a contextual response to the buildings around it. It would be read as a contemporary form that remains subservient to the historic buildings, maintaining the ability to understand and appreciate the heritage values of the assets and view.



***Viewpoint 4 is from High Street at the junction with Nicholas Croft, looking north-east.***

It is considered that the proposal would enhance the sense of cohesion to this local view, the setting of the listed buildings and the character of the conservation area and the overall impact of the proposal would be minor beneficial.

***Summary***

The visual impact assessment demonstrates that the proposal would have a beneficial impact on the character and appearance of the Smithfield Conservation Area by re-instating a gap site, introducing an active use, reinstating the historic building line of High Street and providing cohesion to the urban grain. It would enhance the settings of the identified listed buildings, particularly 75-77 High Street, and the proposal would not affect any other identified listed building.

On balance, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of the nearby listed buildings, and thus complies with Section 66 and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. It does not lead to 'substantial' harm or any meaningful level of 'less than substantial' harm to the setting of the conservation areas, or any other heritage assets. The proposals form part of the high quality regeneration of the city centre and meet the requirements set out in paragraphs 132 and 134 of the NPPF.

For the reasons set out above, it is considered that notwithstanding the considerable weight that must be given to preserving the character and appearance of the nearby listed buildings and the character of the Smithfield Conservation Areas, the proposal has been designed with regard to the sustaining and enhancing the significance

adjacent heritage assets and would make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness and therefore meets with the requirements of paragraph 131 of the NPPF.

### **Architectural Quality**

The building has three distinct components and each would be treated differently to respond to their immediate context and specific role across the linear site.

- The façade design of the tower element would have strong vertical proportions, which are typical of the historic Northern Quarter buildings, and would convey a sense of robustness and solidity which is typical of a masonry façade.
- The lower element addresses the Northern Quarter and is more domestic in scale. This would be clad in the same brick-slip system as the tower, but in a more buff pale red and sandstone tone to match with Basil Chambers and Jewel House.
- The central, eight storey element would appear as a clear division between the two other elements. It would act as a moderator with a seven bay wide, curtain wall of glazing. There would be gold fitted glazed panels at the bottom of each window. The windows would be surrounded by a dark grey anodised aluminium curtain wall framing system round the windows.

The choice of materials seek to respond to Manchester's heritage, but with a contemporary interpretation. A range of bricks has been chosen to tie in with the deep reds and black, as well as more buff sandstone colours which are found around the site. Windows would be recessed and framed in a black aluminium to match the, predominantly glazed, central element of the building.

The façade treatment seeks to reflect the tripartite ordering of many of the historic buildings within the Smithfield Conservation Area and the city centre. There would be an oversized building base, a highly modelled repetitive middle section and a distinctive 'top set' against the skyline. This architectural approach would ensure that the building would contribute to and reflect its historic context. It would provide an active, vibrant response at street-level and an interesting 'top' which breaks up the massing. The proposals therefore accord with Section 7 of the NPPF, Core Strategy Policies EN1, EN2, CC9 and the Guide to Development SPD.

A condition is proposed to ensure the materials are of the highest quality. Any branded signage would be integrated into the building design and details of the proposed size, materials and colour would be dealt with by a planning condition. Subject to high quality materials, finishes and, the new building would have the potential to enhance this part of the conservation area.

### **Independent Design Review of the Proposed Scheme**

An independent design review of the scheme has been carried out by the Architect Stephen Hodder MBE, Chairman of Hodder and Partners.

The brief was to review the proposed scheme design and provide feedback to the applicant. Mr Hodder's comments are summarised below. He agrees that the buildings on site are of low to no architectural or historic interest, and the site as a whole has a negative impact on the character of the Smithfield Conservation Area. He believes that the Design and Access Statement demonstrates a thorough and excellent understanding of the context at both a strategic and detail level and that the site is ideally suited for an apart-hotel. He considers that the cascading design addresses the negative space around the interchange and its pivotal location at the confluence of three character areas, with the finer scale of the Northern Quarter.

Reducing the scale to The Lower Turk's Head and Scuttler's Wine Bar presents an equally acceptable transition, whilst allowing glazed openings to the taller element, animating what could have been a blank gable wall. The Penthouse storey to the High Street element would be appropriate in height but should be reconsidered. He also considers the plan diagrams to be quite ingenious for such a constrained site mitigating any risk of overlooking. The ground floor arrangement will bring much needed activation to Back Turner Street.

The elevations demonstrate a contexture empathy, with good reveals and accents offering contemporary interpretations of notable precedents from the character area. In summary, aside from the refinement to the penthouse storey to the High Street element of the proposal, I can commend and support the proposals.

Following Mr Hodder's feedback, the penthouse design was amended and the tower element was reduced in height.

### **Sustainable Design and Construction**

An Energy Statement illustrates the environmental aspects of the proposal, highlights the Energy/Carbon emission profile and, assesses the options available for reducing energy consumption and associated CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in accordance with Manchester City Council's policies and guidelines. The key conclusions are:

- Estimated carbon emissions from the proposal shows potential for a total reduction in emissions from baseline set by current Building Regulations, by up to 12%.
- The proposal would incorporate leading passive energy techniques available in the construction industry to reduce its ongoing requirement to consume energy to heat, ventilate and light the building.
- It would incorporate energy efficiency measures to reduce the carbon footprint of the site below the passive improvement stage by the use of highly efficient heat generation plant, heat recovery systems and energy efficient and highly controllable lighting.
- The apart-hotel would make use of renewable and Low Carbon energy techniques comprising a Combined Heat and Power system and associated thermal storage to generate domestic hot water. Hot water demand has been identified as the dominant energy requirement.
- The strategy improves on the fundamental principles of the Building Regulations and would make a significant contribution to reducing the annual CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of the development.



### **Contribution to Public Space and Facilities**

The proposal represents a major opportunity to deliver improvements to the public realm. The northern footway on Back Turner Street would be widened to 2.75m, creating more space for pedestrians. The carriageway would be reduced to 3m wide with a 1.5m layby for drop off/pick up. It is proposed that the entire street would be surfaced in high quality materials, with a drop kerb delineating the carriageway and footway areas.

Soap Street would be resurfaced and new kerbs installed. The footways on High Street and Shudehill outside the building frontage would also be enhanced. Two Metrolink overhead line equipment poles would be removed from the pavement at Nicholas Croft and replaced with two eyebolt fixings on the new building.

Given the above, it is considered that the proposals would make a positive contribution to the public realm and facilities and would therefore be consistent with Sections 2 and 7 of the NPPF and policies S06, SP1, CC1, CC7, CC9, CC10, EN1, EN3 and DM1.

### **Effect on the Local Environment**

#### **Transport**

The site is accessible to a variety of public and private transport modes. It is within close walking and cycling distance to a number of key services and facilities and the Shudehill Transport Interchange is immediately opposite the site. Victoria and Piccadilly Rail Stations are nearby.

The Transport Statement states that there would be a negligible impact upon the existing highway network. It includes a Cycle Parking Management Strategy and Framework Travel Plans and sets out the measures that would be taken to promote the use of sustainable modes of transport.

The proposal would also include 13 secure cycle spaces within a cycle storage facility adjacent to the apart-hotel entrance on Back Turner Street.

Car parking spaces are available within the nearby car parks on High Street, Church Street and Shudehill. There are five dedicated public disabled bays within close proximity of the site on High Street.

The Framework Travel Plan sets out measures that would be implemented to affect modal choice and a management strategy for producing a Full Travel Plan. A number of sustainable travel initiatives are proposed to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes in place of car travel to access the development. The Proposed scheme is therefore in accordance with Section 4 of the NPPF and Core Strategy Policies T1 and T2.

### **Environmental Issues**

#### **(a) Sunlight / Daylight**

The nature of high density developments in City Centre locations does mean that amenity issues, such as daylight, sunlight and the proximity of buildings to one another have to be dealt with in an a manner that is appropriate to their context.

An assessment of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing has measured the amount of daylight and sunlight that would be available to windows in a number of neighbouring buildings. The assessment makes reference to the BRE Guide to Good Practice – Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight Second Edition BRE Guide (2011).

This assessment is not mandatory, but is generally accepted as the industry standard. It is used by local planning authorities as a guide to assist in terms of considering these impacts. The guidance does not have 'set' targets and is intended to be interpreted flexibly. It acknowledges that there is a need to take account of locational circumstances, such as a site being within a town or city centre where higher density development is expected and obstruction of natural light to existing buildings is sometimes inevitable.

### **Daylight Assessments**

The BRE Guidelines provides methodologies for daylight assessment. The methodologies are progressive, and can comprise a series of three tests. The BRE Guidance recommends that it is only necessary to progress to the next test, if the window/room does not pass the first test it was subjected to.

Firstly, the guidance advises an assessment of how much daylight can be received at the face of a window which is generally referred to as the Vertical Sky Component (or VSC). This is a measure of the percentage of the sky that is visible from the centre of a window. The less sky that can be seen from a window means that the daylight available would be less. Thus, the lower the VSC, the less well-lit the room would be. In order to achieve the daylight recommendations in the BRE, a window should attain a VSC of at least 27%.

A second assessment called 'Daylight Distribution assesses how the light is cast into the room. It examines the parts of the room where there would be a direct sky view and the parts that would not have direct sky view. Daylight may be adversely affected if, after the development, the area in a room which can receive direct skylight is reduced to less than 0.8 times its former value. If it is reduced to less than 0.8, it would be noticeable to the occupants.

The BRE Guidance states that a reduction of VSC to a window more than 20% does not necessarily mean that the room served would be left inadequately lit; it means that there is a greater chance that the reduction in daylight would be more apparent to the occupier.

The third measure is called Average Daylight Factor (ADF). This assesses how much daylight comes into a room and its distribution within the room taking into account factors such as room size and layout. Considerations include:

- The net glazed area of the window in question;
- The total area of the room surfaces (ceiling, walls, floor and windows); and

- The angle of visible sky reaching the window(s) in question

In addition, the ADF method makes allowance for the average reflectance of the internal surfaces of the room. The criteria for ADF is taken from the British Standard 8206 part II which gives the following targets based on the room use: Bedroom is 1% ADF; Living Room is 1.5% ADF and; Kitchen is 2% ADF.

Where a room has multiple uses such as a living kitchen diner or a studio apartment, the highest value is taken so in these cases the required ADF is 2%.

A key factor in relation to the second and third tests is that these tests assess daylight levels within a whole room rather than just that reaching an individual window. They are, therefore, a more accurate reflection of any overall daylight loss. The assessment submitted with this application has considered all three of the progressive tests for daylight assessment within the guidance.

It is noted that VSC levels diminish as building heights increase relative to the distance of separation. The BRE guide acknowledges that if a building stands close to a common boundary, a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable. This is common in city centre streets in particular.

As such, the adoption of the 'standard target values' is not the norm in a city centre. The BRE Guide recognises that different targets may be appropriate and encourages the setting of alternative targets values as a means of adjusting the low density targets intended for suburban locations. For this scheme in this higher density location, an alternative daylight target of 21.6% VSC has been used.

### **Potential Impacts**

The key receptors around the site are those windows that serve habitable rooms in the following neighbouring buildings:

- 10-20 Thomas Street (Jewel House);
- 2-4 Thomas Street
- 72-76 High Street and 11-21 Turner Street;
- Market Buildings (83 High Street);
- Market Buildings (17 Thomas Street).

The impacts of the development within this context are set out below.

#### ***10-20 Thomas Street (Jewel House)***

- 93 individual windows have been appraised. These are windows that are known to serve rooms that rely upon the application site for daylight.
- 69 of the windows (74%) would achieve the alternative 21.6% VSC target in the baseline condition. 24 windows (26%) do not. The proposal would reduce the amount of sky that these windows receive over the application site. 32 windows (34.5%) would continue to achieve the alternative 21.6% VSC target or experience a less than 20% reduction in the baseline VSC, which the BRE confirms would not be noticed by the room occupants.

- There are 20 windows (21.5%) that would not achieve the alternative VSC target and would experience a reduction in baseline VSC that would be noticed by the room occupants. However, these are not the only windows that serve the same room and the internal distribution of sky light within the room would not be materially affected by the proposed scheme.
- 52 windows (56% ) would comply with the BRE criterion. 41 windows would not achieve the alternative 21.6% VSC target, and/or experience more than 20% reductions in sky visibility over the application site and/or the movement in the internal distribution of sky light / NSL would be noticed by the room occupants.
- Some of the rooms are likely to serve living rooms. The scale of change for the majority of the windows affected would be substantial. The impact that the proposed scheme would have on the daylight amenity of the rooms served by these 40 windows would be materially adverse.

The windows in Soap Street overlook a gap site where a four storey building was demolished in the early 1980s. The level of light is high because the site is currently used as a car park. The massing of the former building would have had more or less the same impact as the current scheme and they would have received significantly less daylight than they do currently.

The windows currently receive more than their fair share of light over the application site and this places a burden on the application site. The applicant has carried out an appraisal of a building of hypothetical height to this neighbouring building and established an alternative VSC using BRE Guidance. Using the guidance and based on an obstruction angle of 63 degrees, an alternative VSC of 6% is established. This would amount to the “fair share” of daylight that the windows of Jewel House would receive if the vacant, gap site is to be redeveloped to its former height and massing. 74 windows (80% of all appraised) would maintain a 6% VSC.

On balance, it is concluded that the proposed scheme would largely respect the amount of light that these windows would have received if: a building of comparable massing was constructed on the application site; or if the gap site was redeveloped to the extent that it was historically.

### **11-21 Turner Street**

- 48 individual windows have been appraised. 37 windows (77%) achieve the alternative 21.6% VSC target in the baseline condition. 11 windows (23%) do not. The proposal would reduce the amount of sky these windows could see over the application site.
- All windows (100%) would continue to achieve the alternative 21.6% VSC target or experience a less than 20% reduction in the baseline VSC, which the BRE confirm would not be noticed by the room occupants.



On balance, it is concluded that the impact that the proposed scheme would have the daylighting amenity would be an acceptable one.

***Market Buildings (17 Thomas Street)***

- 93 individual windows have been appraised. 75 windows (81%) would achieve the alternative 21.6% VSC target in the baseline condition. 18 windows (19%) would not. The proposal would reduce the amount of sky that these windows receive over the site. 90 windows (97%) would continue to achieve the alternative 21.6% VSC target or experience a less than 20% reduction in the baseline VSC, which the BRE confirms would not be noticed by the room occupants.
- There are three windows (3%) that would no longer achieve the alternative 21.6% VSC target. The individual results for these windows do not amount to a materially adverse impact because
  - the reduction in existing VSC value amounts to a low magnitude of change and is only marginally greater than that accepted by the BRE as de Minimis.
  - The windows are not the only windows that serve the room.
  - The internal distribution of sky light within the room would not be materially affected. The movement in the NSL would not be noticed by the room occupants.

On balance, it is concluded that the impact that the proposed scheme would have the daylighting amenity would be an acceptable one.

***Market Buildings (83 High Street)***

- 121 individual windows have been appraised. 73 windows (60%) would achieve the alternative 21.6% VSC target in the baseline condition. 48 windows (40%) would not.
- The proposal would reduce the amount of sky that these windows can see over the Site. All windows (100%) would continue to achieve the alternative 21.6% VSC target or experience a less than 20% reduction in the baseline VSC, which the BRE confirm would not be noticed by the room occupants.

On balance, it is concluded that the impact that the proposed scheme would have the daylighting amenity would be an acceptable one.

***2-4 Thomas Street***

- Four individual windows have been appraised. Two windows (50%) would achieve the alternative 21.6% VSC target in the baseline condition. Two windows (50%) would not.
- The proposed scheme would reduce the amount of sky that these windows can see over the Site. All windows (100%) would continue to achieve the alternative 21.6% VSC target or experience a less than 20% reduction in the baseline VSC, which the BRE confirm would not be noticed by the room occupants.

On balance, it is concluded that the impact that the proposal would have the daylighting amenity would be an acceptable one.

### ***Sunlight Amenity Impact***

The BRE Guide considers that only windows facing within 90 degrees of due south to have any realistic expectation of receiving sunlight and need to be appraised. The BRE places particular emphasis on the availability of sunlight to living rooms. Other room uses are of lesser or no sensitivity to change in the sunlight availability.

Baseline and proposed annual probable sunlight hours (APSH) values have been calculated for the affected windows. The rear courtyard windows of 11-21 Turner Street are not identified as key sunlight receptors as the application site is located to the north. As a result, the proposal would have no influence on the sunlight received.

10-20 Thomas Street, 2-4 Thomas Street and both Market Buildings, all have a windows facing within 90° of due south and rely upon the application site, to some degree, for the supply of sunlight. The sunlight impact of the proposal has been benchmarked against an alternative sunlight target of 4% winter APSH and 20% annual APSH. Because many of the rooms are served by multiple windows or are dual aspect, the results are described on a room-by-room basis.

#### ***10-20 Thomas Street (Jewel House)***

- 30 individual rooms have been appraised, served by 80 individual windows. 29 rooms (96.5%) and 68 windows (85%) would achieve the 4% winter and 20% annual APSH alternative target in the baseline condition.
- The proposed scheme would reduce the number of sunlight hours currently enjoyed. However, 23 rooms (76.5%) would continue to achieve the 4% winter and 20% annual APSH alternative target in the proposed condition.
- One other room (3.5%) would continue to achieve the alternative 4% APSH winter target and only narrowly not achieve the alternative annual target. It would measure 19% APSH rather than the target 20%. There is also a room (3.5%) that would continue to achieve the alternative 20% APSH target and only narrowly not achieve the alternative winter target (3% APSH rather than the target 4%). In this regard, there is a high degree of BRE design guidance compliance for these rooms.
- There are five rooms (20%) that would no longer continue to achieve the 4% winter and 20% annual APSH alternative target that they do in the baseline condition. The reduction in sunlight hours is more than 20% of the baseline values and in this regard, it would be noticed by the room occupants. The magnitude of change can be broadly categorised as significant.
- On face value this is a significant impact. There are, however, mitigating factors that have to be taken into consideration and are broadly the same as the daylight results described above. The windows of the building currently receives more than their fair share of sunlight over the application site because part of it is a vacant, gap site. That has not always been the case and the massing of the building on the site would have been an obvious and significant influence on the extent to which the windows would've received sunlight over the application site. The windows would have received significantly less sunlight than they do currently.
- There is embedded mitigation due to the scheme design being of comparable massing to the neighbouring buildings (and the former building) at its High Street end.

On balance, the impact that the proposal would have on the sunlight amenity of this neighbouring building is acceptable in a city centre context. The majority of the rooms would continue to receive good levels of sunlight. The measured difference between baseline and proposed conditions could be described as a significant impact to a minority of rooms, but there is genuine mitigation.

## **2 – 4 Thomas Street**

- Two individual rooms have been sunlight appraised, served by 2 individual windows. All rooms (100%) and all windows appraised achieve the 4% winter and 20% annual APSH alternative target in the baseline condition.
- The proposal would reduce the number of sunlight hours currently enjoyed. However, all rooms (100%) would continue to achieve the 4% winter and 20% annual APSH alternative target in the proposed condition, or the reduction in baseline APSH values would be less than the 20% reduction that is accepted by the BRE, because it would not be noticed by the room occupants.

On balance, it is concluded that the impact that the proposed scheme would have the sunlight amenity would be an acceptable one.

## **Market Buildings (17 Thomas Street)**

- 39 individual rooms have been sunlight appraised, served by 92 individual windows. 36 rooms (92%) and 71 (77%) of all windows appraised achieve the 4% winter and 20% annual APSH alternative target in the baseline condition.
- The proposed scheme would reduce the number of sunlight hours currently enjoyed. However, all rooms (100%) would continue to achieve the 4% winter and 20% annual APSH alternative target in the proposed condition, or the reduction in baseline APSH values would be less than the 20% reduction that is accepted by the BRE, because it would not be noticed by the room occupants.

On balance, it is concluded that the impact that the proposed scheme would have the sunlight amenity would be an acceptable one.

## **Market Buildings (83 High Street)**

- 90 individual rooms have been sunlight appraised, served by 121 individual windows. All rooms (100%) and 113 (93%) of all windows appraised achieve the 4% winter and 20% annual APSH alternative target in the baseline condition.
- The proposed scheme would reduce the number of sunlight hours currently enjoyed. Notwithstanding the reduction, all rooms (100%) would continue to achieve the 4% winter and 20% annual APSH alternative target in the proposed condition, or the reduction in baseline APSH values would be less than the 20% reduction that is accepted by the BRE, because it would not be noticed by the room occupants.

On balance, it is concluded that the impacts of the proposed scheme on sunlight amenity would be an acceptable one that the proposed scheme would have the sunlight amenity would be an acceptable one.

### ***Sunlight to Open Spaces***

There are no neighbouring external amenity spaces around the application site that would justify the need for a two hour time in sun appraisal.

### ***Summary***

The Daylight and Sunlight Amenity Assessment has evaluated the potential impacts of the proposed scheme on key neighbouring properties. The Assessment concludes that the impacts of the proposed scheme on daylight amenity would be acceptable for the windows at 2-4 Thomas Street, 72-76 High Street and 11-21 Turner Street, Market Buildings (83 High Street) and Market Buildings (17 Thomas Street). The impacts on sunlight amenity at 2-4 Thomas Street, 72-76 High Street, Market Buildings (83 High Street) and Market Buildings (17 Thomas Street) are also considered to be acceptable.

Some of the windows facing onto Soap Street and the application site at 10-20 Thomas Street (Jewel House) would lose some daylight and sunlight amenity from the proposed scheme. This is an important amenity issue that does need some consideration. These windows have benefitted from the open nature of the land at the High Street end of the application site for a number of years. While it may be preferable for some residents to see the site remain as an informal car park, the land does have development potential and in every other respect, the proposal is acceptable in planning terms and in terms of its impact on the historic environment. It would deliver high quality apart-hotel accommodation in an appropriate area and would enhance the character and appearance of the Smithfield Conservation Area.

The proposed scheme largely respects the "fair share" of light that Jewel House could expect to receive if the site were to be developed with a building of comparable height to the previous building on the site and to neighbouring buildings. It is considered, on balance, therefore that the public benefits of the proposed scheme would outweigh the loss of amenity to some residential properties overlooking Soap Street and the application site.

### **(b) Impact on Privacy**

A number of consultation responses have raised concerns with regard to overlooking, with particular reference to the distance between the proposed scheme and existing residential properties within Jewel House.

The distances between windows on the proposed scheme and existing buildings along Soap Street and Back Turner Street are 4.55 metres and 6.44 metres respectively at the narrowest points.

Soap Street is the quieter of the two streets. Its main function is a service and access street and is used for bin collections. It is proposed that Soap Street would remain within a primarily service / access function. The ground floor of the proposed apart-

hotel would have a clear 'front' and 'back' with Soap Street side dedicated to back-of-house entrances and functions.

On the upper floors, the proposed loft apartments would be arranged in a row facing Back Turner Street. All circulation space would be located on the north edge of the building. Glazing would be largely opaque; with the exception of the ground floor which would provide natural surveillance to Soap Street. Along much of the length of Back Turner Street, the street is widened from its existing 6.5 metres to approximately seven metres. At the upper floors this has the effect of reducing overlooking of Basil Chambers and at ground floor this creates the opportunity for adjusting the road and pavement widths to increase the generosity and quality of space to the benefit of pedestrians.

These distances are characteristic of the site context and reflect the dense urban environment of the Northern Quarter. The proposed redevelopment of the 'gap-site' fronting High Street would reinstate the historic city block.

To provide a context there are many instances within the Northern Quarter where residential properties experience overlooking distances similar to those which would result from the proposal scheme, including:

- Catlow Lane - 3.5 metres;
- Kelvin Street - 4.7 metres; and
- Carpenters Lane - 5.5 metres.

The proposal would create an environment between the site and Basil Chambers / Jewel House which is consistent with the character and streetscape of the Northern Quarter and the proposal complies with Core Strategy Policy DM1.

### **(c) Air Quality**

An Air Quality Assessment considers the potential dust and fine particulate matter impacts associated with the construction phase, and the suitability of the site for future users. The Assessment has been undertaken in accordance with guidance published by the IAQM.

During the construction phase, the significance of dust effects from earthworks, construction and trackout would not be significant, subject to mitigation measures being in place. The development would not be exposed to unacceptable levels of air pollution when in use and would not lead to any increase in air pollution in the vicinity of the site and would comply with Core Strategy Policy EN16 and Section 11 of the NPPF.

### **(d) Noise**

A Noise Assessment considers the suitability of the site for an apart-hotel use, as well as the noise breakout from the building services to nearby sensitive receptors. It concludes that the proposal would have no significant effect in terms of construction, noise and vibration, building plant and traffic noise.

The design of the development, including the façade and glazing treatment, would comply with Manchester City Council's requirements for hotel development. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Core Strategy Policy DM1, Saved UDP Policy DC26, as well as Paragraph 123 of the NPPF.

#### **(e) Refuse and Servicing**

A servicing strategy is set out within the Transport Statement which would utilise the existing loading bay on the northern side of High Street and, on occasion, allows on-street servicing on the north-eastern side of Back Turner Street.

Clean goods would be delivered via Back Turner Street and larger vehicles would use an existing shared loading bay on High Street for refuse collection and general deliveries. The proposed scheme is therefore in compliance with Core Strategy Policy DM1 and the Guide to Development SPD.

#### **(f) Flood Risk**

A Flood Risk Statement confirms that the site is located in Flood Zone 1 in the Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning and is at a low risk from all types of flooding. It identifies that the proposal would not increase the risk of flooding for the site or areas within the vicinity of the site.

The Drainage Strategy identifies that the surface water would be formally discharged to the public combined sewer system with the Sustainable Urban Drainage System ("SUDS") methods in the form of vortex control to reduce flow rate and a cellular storage tank being used to prevent flooding.

#### **(g) Ecology**

An Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey has identified that there are no habitats of nature conservation interest within the site, and low to negligible potential for roosting bats within the existing buildings. Habitats were also considered to be of low value for foraging or commuting bats. It is recommended that a single bat activity survey is undertaken between May and August to confirm if bats are using the site.

The existing buildings are used for nesting by feral pigeons and the site is identified to be within a Priority Area for black redstart. The site is, however, identified to have a low potential for nesting of black redstarts due to the highly-exposed nature of the site and the dilapidated structure of the buildings and the high use by feral pigeons.

It is recommended that any future demolition work is undertaken in the winter period (i.e. during October to February inclusive). If this is not possible, a suitably experienced ecologist should check the habitat for breeding bird activity no more than 48 hours before clearance. If nesting activity is found, it will need to be left in situ until the nesting effort has been completed.

Two Informatives are proposed covering bats and biodiversity measures.

#### **(h) Archaeology**

A Desk Based Assessment recommends that the warehouses are recorded through a photographic and descriptive survey, with a watching brief undertaken during demolition to enhance the archive record as access is limited on health and safety grounds. The below-ground interest should be evaluated through archaeological trial trenching. Further trenching could be required following demolition. This may lead to a final phase of site work in the form of more detailed targeted excavation and recording.

A condition is proposed requiring a Written Scheme of Investigation.

### **Full Access and Inclusive Design**

The proposal would provide a safe, legible, high quality environment that would be easily used by a wide range of people without undue effort, special treatment or separation. The overall approach to the design would exceed the minimum access standards as required by Manchester City Council Core Strategy Policies (CC2, EN9, EN10 and EN11) and Building Regulations Part B.

### **Contamination**

A Phase 1 Environmental Desk Study has identified that the site is not located within any significant contamination risk zones. It overlies a major and minor aquifer and there is an associated groundwater vulnerability beneath the site. The site is within a former coal mining area, but ground movements associated with this are expected to have ceased.

The existing warehouse building has asbestos-containing materials. There may be some historic contamination from the previous industrial use of the site. The Report sets out that the site is suitable for redevelopment and sets out a number of recommendations which have been considered during the design process and would continue to inform the development process. This includes undertaking a fully intrusive Phase Two site investigation and contamination assessment, as well as undertaking a full asbestos survey of existing buildings prior to demolition.

### **Construction Management**

The site is located within a dense urban environment and the construction process would have to be managed carefully to minimise any impact upon neighbouring residents and those working in the vicinity of the Site.

A condition is proposed requiring a detailed Construction Management Plan. This would be developed with the chosen Contractor, and include details of site set-up, logistics (deliveries, unloading) and the physical undertaking of the works. This would be agreed with Manchester City Council in advance of the commencement of any works on the Site.

### **Crime Impact**

A Crime Impact Statement (CIS), prepared by the Greater Manchester Police Architectural Liaison Unit makes a series of recommendations regarding measures that could be undertaken in order to minimise the risk of crime.

It concludes that the proposals are appropriate in terms of minimising opportunities for criminal activity, and notes that the proposal would bring additional activity and vitality to the area during the day and night, potentially increasing the security of the development and surrounding developers.

The CIS makes a number of recommendations to be considered as the detailed design of the proposed scheme is progressed. The design team would continue to work with officers from GMP through the detailed design process.

### **Consultee and Objectors' comments**

It is considered that the majority of the grounds of objection have been addressed in the main body of this report.

### **Conclusion**

The site is located on a major gateway entry into the city centre and at a key nodal point. It is also within the Northern Quarter which has been, and continues to be, a focus for major public and private investment. The proposed use is acceptable in principle and is consistent the City Councils planning policy and regeneration objectives.

The site is partly-derelict and partly-vacant site and has a negative impact on a prominent gateway entry route and the Smithfield Conservation Area. The proposal would provide a well-designed, high quality new building, which would respond to the existing and historic context. It would provide substantial public realm improvements around the site.

The proposal would have a beneficial impact on the character and appearance of the Smithfield Conservation Area by putting a current gap site back into active use, reinstating the historic building line of High Street.

It is considered that the proposed scheme would not adversely affect the understanding or appreciation of the Grade II listed buildings near the site or other heritage assets in the surrounding area, resulting in an overall neutral effect.

The proposal would have an impact on the amenity of some existing residents who overlook the site, but these have to be considered in a city centre context where buildings tend to be situated in closer proximity to one another.

Notwithstanding the considerable weight that must be given to preserving the setting of the listed buildings and conservation areas as required by virtue of Sections 66 and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act, the level of harm caused would be less than substantial and would be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme thus meeting the requirements set out in paragraphs 132 and 134 of the NPPF.

The proposal is in accordance with the City of Manchester's planning policies and regeneration priorities, including the Adopted Core Strategy, the City Centre Strategic Plan and the Community Strategy. It is also in accordance with the national planning



policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and should be approved.

**Human Rights Act 1998 considerations** – This application needs to be considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Under Article 6, the applicants (and those third parties, including local residents, who have made representations) have the right to a fair hearing and to this end the Committee must give full consideration to their comments.

Protocol 1 Article 1, and Article 8 where appropriate, confer(s) a right of respect for a person's home, other land and business assets. In taking account of all material considerations, including Council policy as set out in the Core Strategy and saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan, the Head of Planning, Building Control & Licensing has concluded that some rights conferred by these articles on the applicant(s)/objector(s)/resident(s) and other occupiers and owners of nearby land that might be affected may be interfered with but that that interference is in accordance with the law and justified by being in the public interest and on the basis of the planning merits of the development proposal. She believes that any restriction on these rights posed by the approval of the application is proportionate to the wider benefits of approval and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

**Recommendation      APPROVE**

### **Article 35 Declaration**

Officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and pro-active manner to seek solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. Officers held pre-application discussions with the applicant to establish the in-principle acceptability of the proposed development. Also, officers worked with the applicant during the planning application process to deal with comments raised by consultees.

### **Conditions to be attached to the decision**

#### **Recommended conditions for 116189/FO/2017**

1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

- Site Plan – Planning Application Boundary 05593\_MP\_00\_0001
- Site Plan – Proposed 05593\_MP\_00\_0002
- Existing Topographical Plan 05593\_MP\_00\_0003 Rev A
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan 05593\_MP\_00\_0200 Rev D

- Proposed Lower Ground Floor Level 05593\_B1\_02\_2199 Rev G
- Proposed Ground Floor Level 05593\_B1\_02\_2200 Rev N
- Proposed Floors 1 to 3 05593\_B1\_02\_2201 Rev J
- Proposed Floor 4 05593\_B1\_02\_2204 Rev C
- Proposed Floor 5 to 7 05593\_B1\_02\_2205 Rev J
- Proposed Floors 8 to 11 05593\_B1\_02\_2208 Rev H
- Proposed Floor 12 05593\_B1\_02\_2210 Rev L
- Proposed Roof Plan 05593\_B1\_02\_2211 Rev J
- Elevation A – Existing and Demolition 05593\_B1\_04\_2000 Rev B
- Elevation B – Existing and Demolition 05593\_B1\_04\_2001 Rev B
- Elevation C – Existing and Demolition 05593\_B1\_04\_2002 Rev B
- Elevation A – Proposed 05593\_B1\_04\_2200 Rev C
- Elevation B – Proposed 05593\_B1\_04\_2201 Rev D
- Elevation C – Proposed 05593\_B1\_04\_2202 Rev D
- Elevation C – Proposed 05593\_B1\_04\_2203 Rev C
- Proposed Sections AA 05593\_B1\_05\_2200 Rev C
- Proposed Sections BB 05593\_B1\_05\_2201 Rev C
- Proposed Sections CC 05593\_B1\_05\_2202 Rev C
- Proposed Sections DD 05593\_B1\_05\_2203 Rev C
- Typical Bay Detail 01 05593\_B1\_10\_2200 Rev A
- Typical Bay Detail 02 05593\_B1\_10\_2201 Rev A
- Typical Bay Detail 03 05593\_B1\_10\_2202 Rev A
- Layby Development RF-17-394-L05 Rev 04
- Illustrative Masterplan RF-17-394-L04 Rev P03
- Layby Development RF-17-394-L05 Rev 05
- Illustrative Masterplan RF-17-394-L04 Rev P04
- Swept Path Analysis – Initiative Site Layout 63394-102 Rev G
- Design & Access Statement prepared by 5plus Architects dated May 2017
- Planning Addendum Document prepared 5plus Architects dated 25 October 2017
- Planning Policy Compliance Statement prepared by Euan Kellie Property Solutions dated May 2017
- Heritage Statement prepared by Stephen Levrant Heritage Architecture dated September 2017
- Structural Report prepared by Renaissance dated September 2017
- Archaeological Desk Based Assessment prepared by Archaeological Research Services dated March 2017
- Transport Statement prepared by Curtins dated 5 May 2017
- Framework Travel Plan prepared by Curtins dated 26 April 2017
- Ecological Assessment prepared by Penny Anderson Associates dated April 2017
- Bat Activity Survey prepared by Penny Anderson Associates dated 16 June 2017
- Air Quality Assessment prepared by Wardell Armstrong dated 2 May 2017
- Flood Risk Assessment prepared by CCS Consulting dated 13 April 2017
- Surface Water Management Report prepared by CCS Consulting dated 13 April 2017
- Phase 1 Desk Study Report prepared by CCS Consulting dated 5 September 2017
- Noise Assessment prepared by dBx Acoustics dated 18 October 2017

- Crime Impact Statement prepared by Greater Manchester Police dated 4 May 2017
- Energy Statement prepared by Futureserv dated 5 May 2017
- Environmental Standards Statement prepared by Watergrove dated 4 May 2017
- Ventilation Statement prepared by Futureserv dated 21 April 2017
- Daylight and Sunlight Assessment prepared by Gray Scanlan Hill
- Pre-Construction Signal Reception Impact Survey prepared by Astbury dated 6 February 2017
- Wind Microclimate Desk Study prepared by BMT Fluid Mechanics dated 26 April 2017

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable to the City Council as local planning authority in the interests of the visual amenity of the area within which the site is located, as specified in policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

3) Prior to the commencement of the development, a programme for the issue of samples and specifications of all materials to be used on all external elevations shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Samples and specification of all materials to be used on all external elevations of the development to include jointing and fixing details, details of the drips to be used to prevent staining and a strategy for quality control management shall then be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority in accordance with the programme as agreed above. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable to the City Council as local planning authority in the interests of the visual amenity of the area within which the site is located, as specified in policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

4) Before the development is occupied, full details of proposed signage for the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The proposed signage shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the area and to ensure the development is carried out in a satisfactory manner pursuant to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

5) Before the development is occupied, a building lighting scheme demonstrating how the development would be lit during the period between dusk and dawn shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interests of amenity, crime reduction and the personal safety of those using the proposed development, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

6) The proposed development should be designed and constructed in accordance with the recommendations contained within the submitted Crime Impact Statement. Within three months of the development hereby approved being occupied, written confirmation of a Secured by Design accreditation must be submitted to the local planning authority.

Reason: To reduce the risk of crime pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

7) No externally mounted telecommunications equipment shall be mounted on any part of the building hereby approved, including the roofs.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity pursuant to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

8) Development shall not commence until the approved Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been updated to include the additional details and has been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority.

The detailed CMP shall include details of the following:

- Programme and phasing
- Demolition and construction methodology
- Site Establishment and Logistics
- Phasing and quantification /classification of vehicular activity associated with planned construction. This should include commentary on types and frequency of vehicular demands together with evidence (including appropriate swept path assessment) of satisfactory routeing both within the site and on the adjacent highway;
- Contractor parking and ongoing construction works in the locality;
- A dilapidation survey, including photographs and commentary on the condition of carriageway / footways on construction vehicle routes surrounding the site.
- Details of proposed Metrolink overhead line equipment building fixings and methodology
- The wheels of contractors' vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned and the access roads leading to the site swept daily in accordance with a management scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority prior to works commencing on site;
- Noise & Vibration (in addition to a dust emission /air quality section) that shall base the assessment on British Standard 5228, with reference to other relevant standards;
- Site Environment Plan
- Sustainability section
- A community consultation strategy which includes how and when local businesses and residents will be consulted on matters such out of hours works.

- Any proposal for out of hours works (as below) will be submitted to and approved by this section, the details of which shall be submitted at least four weeks in advance of such works commencing.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable and in the interests of the amenity of the area, pursuant to policies EN15, EN16, EN17 and EN18 of the Core Strategy and Guide to Development 2 (SPG).

9) Before development commences, a local labour agreement relating to the construction phase of development, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the City Council as local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be in place prior to the commencement of the development, and shall be kept in place for the duration of the construction phase of the development.

Reason - To safeguard local employment opportunities, pursuant to policies EC1 of the Core Strategy for Manchester.

10) Deliveries, servicing and collections, including waste collections shall not take place outside the following hours: 07:30 to 20:00, Monday to Saturday, Sunday and Bank Holiday the permitted times shall be confined to 10:00 to 18:00

Reason - To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential accommodation, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

11) Fumes, vapours and odours shall be extracted and discharged from the premises in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority before the use commences. Any works approved shall be implemented before the use commences. Mixed use schemes shall ensure provision for internal ducting in risers that terminate at roof level. Schemes that are outside the scope of such developments shall ensure that flues terminate at least 1m above the eave level and/or any openable windows/ventilation intake.

Defra have published a document entitled 'Guidance on the Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems'. It describes a method of risk assessment for odour, guidance on minimum requirements for odour and noise control, and advice on equipment selection. It is recommended that any scheme should make reference to this document.

Reason - In the interests of the amenities of occupiers of nearby properties, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

12) Opening hours for any commercial uses to be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority.

To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential accommodation, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

13) The premises shall be acoustically insulated and treated to limit the break out of noise in accordance with a noise study of the premises and a scheme of acoustic

treatment that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

The scheme proposed shall normally include measures such as acoustic lobbies at access and egress points of the premises, acoustic treatment of the building structure, sound limiters linked to sound amplification equipment and specified maximum internal noise levels. The scheme shall be implemented in full before the use commences or as otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Where entertainment noise is proposed the  $L_{Aeq}$  (entertainment noise) shall be controlled to 10dB below the  $L_{A90}$  (without entertainment noise) in each octave band at the facade of the nearest noise sensitive location, and internal noise levels at structurally adjoined residential properties in the 63Hz and 125Hz octave frequency bands shall be controlled so as not to exceed (in habitable rooms) 47dB and 41dB, respectively.

Reason - To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of the building and occupiers of nearby properties, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

14) Any use of the external areas within the application site shall only be permitted in accordance with a schedule of days and hours of operation submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority, and shall not allow for the use of amplified sound or any music in these external areas at any time.

Reason - To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

15) Before the development commences a scheme for acoustically insulating the proposed apart-hotel accommodation against noise from the local transport network shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. There may be other actual or potential sources of noise which require consideration on or near the site, including any local commercial/industrial premises. The approved noise insulation scheme shall be completed before any of the dwelling units are occupied.

Noise survey data must include measurements taken during a rush-hour period and night time to determine the appropriate sound insulation measures necessary. The internal noise criteria are as follows:

Bedrooms (night time - 23.00 - 07.00)	30 dB $L_{Aeq}$ (individual noise events shall not exceed 45 dB $L_{Amax,F}$ by more than 15 times)
Living Rooms (daytime - 07.00 - 23.00)	35 dB $L_{Aeq}$
Gardens and terraces (daytime)	55 dB $L_{Aeq}$

Due to the proximity of the development to the tramline it will be necessary for vibration criteria to apply which can be found in BS 6472: 2008 *“Guide to evaluation of human exposure to vibration in buildings”*. Groundborne noise/re-radiated noise should also be factored into the assessment and design.

Additionally, where entertainment noise is a factor in the noise climate the sound insulation scheme shall be designed to achieve internal noise levels in the 63Hz and 125Hz octave centre frequency bands so as not to exceed (in habitable rooms) 47dB and 41dB, respectively.

Reason: To secure a reduction in noise from traffic or other sources in order to protect future apart-hotel residents from noise disturbance, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

16) Externally mounted ancillary plant, equipment and servicing shall be selected and/or acoustically treated in accordance with a scheme designed so as to achieve a rating level of 5dB (LAeq) below the typical background (LA90) level at the nearest noise sensitive location.

The scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority in order to secure a reduction in the level of noise emanating from the site.

Reason - To minimize the impact of the development and to prevent a general increase in pre-existing background noise levels around the site, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

17) Before the development commences, a scheme for the storage and disposal of refuse shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The details of the approved scheme shall be implemented as part of the development and shall remain in situ whilst the use or development is in operation.

New developments shall have refuse storage space for segregated waste collection and recycling. Internal and external storage areas are required.

Reason - In the interests of amenity and public health, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

18) Before the development is occupied, a servicing management strategy, including a schedule of loading and unloading locations and times, must be submitted to and agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. Servicing shall thereafter take place in accordance with the approved plan.

Reason: In the interests of public and highway safety and the protection of residential amenity, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

19) Before the development hereby approved commences, a report (the Preliminary Risk Assessment) to identify and evaluate all potential sources and impacts of any ground contamination, groundwater contamination and/or ground gas relevant to the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The Preliminary Risk Assessment shall conform to City Council's current guidance document (Planning Guidance in Relation to Ground Contamination).



In the event of the Preliminary Risk Assessment identifying risks which, in the written opinion of the Local Planning Authority require further investigation, the development shall not commence until a scheme for the investigation of the site and the identification of remediation measures (the Site Investigation Proposal) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

The measures for investigating the site identified in the Site Investigation Proposal shall be carried out, before development commences and a report prepared outlining what measures, if any, are required to remediate the land (the Site Investigation Report and/or Remediation Strategy) which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

When the development commences, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the previously agreed Remediation Strategy and a Completion/Verification Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City with the Revised Remediation Strategy, which shall take precedence over any Remediation Strategy or earlier Revised Remediation Strategy.

Reason - To ensure that the presence of or the potential for any contaminated land and/or groundwater is detected and appropriate remedial action is taken in the interests of public safety, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy.

20) Foul and surface water shall be drained on separate systems.

Reason: To secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

21) No development hereby permitted shall be occupied until details of the implementation, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details. Those details shall include:

- Verification report providing photographic evidence of construction as per design drawings;
- As built construction drawings if different from design construction drawings;
- Management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.

Reason: To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

22) Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the local planning authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that

there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - In the interests of amenity and public health, pursuant to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy for the City of Manchester.

23) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the Framework Travel Framework Travel Plan prepared by Curtins dated 26 April 2017 Plan stamped as received by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, on 19 May 2017.

In this condition a Travel Plan means a document which includes:

- i. the measures proposed to be taken to reduce dependency on the private car by those working at and visiting the development;
- ii. a commitment to surveying the travel patterns of staff during the first three months of the first use of the building and thereafter from time to time
- iii. mechanisms for the implementation of the measures to reduce dependency on the private car
- iv. measures for the delivery of specified travel plan services
- v. measures to monitor and review the effectiveness of the Travel Plan in achieving the objective of reducing dependency on the private car

Within six months of the first use of the development, a Travel Plan which takes into account the information about travel patterns gathered pursuant to item (ii) above shall be submitted for approval in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority. Any Travel Plan which has been approved by the City Council as Local Planning Authority shall be implemented in full at all times when the development hereby approved is in use.

Reason - To assist promoting the use of sustainable forms of travel for employees and hotel guests, pursuant to policies T1, T2 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

24) Notwithstanding the details shown on drawing RF-17-394-L04 stamped as received by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, on 19 May 2017, prior to the first use of the building, details of the provision of the cycle storage and lighting location and design shall be submitted for approval in writing by the City Council, as local planning authority.

The approved details shall then be implemented prior to the first occupation/use and thereafter retained and maintained in situ for as long as the development remains in use.

Reason - To ensure there is sufficient cycle stand provision at the development and the residents in order to support modal shift measures pursuant to policies SP1, T1, T2 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

25) Prior to the first use of the development hereby approved, a scheme of highway works and details of footpaths reinstatement/public realm in relation to High Street,

Soap Street, Back Turner Street and Shudehill shall be submitted for approval in writing by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To ensure safe access to the development site in the interest of pedestrian and highway safety pursuant to policies SP1, EN1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

26) No development shall take place until the applicant or their agents or successors in title has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological works. The works are to be undertaken in accordance with Written Schemes of Investigation (WSI) submitted to and approved in writing by Manchester Planning Authority. The WSIs shall cover the following:

1. A phased programme and methodology of investigation and recording to include:

- a Historic England Level 1 historic building survey
- archaeological evaluation through trial trenching
- informed by the above, more detailed targeted excavation and historic research (subject of a new WSI)

2. A programme for post investigation assessment to include:

- analysis of the site investigation records and finds
- production of a final report on the significance of the archaeological and historical interest represented.

3. Dissemination of the results commensurate with their significance.

4. Provision for archive deposition of the report and records of the site investigation.

5. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the approved WSI.

Reason: In accordance with NPPF Section 12, Paragraph 141 - To record and advance understanding of heritage assets impacted on by the development and to make information about the archaeological heritage interest publicly accessible.

### **Informatives**

1) Section 278 Works - proposed external works would require a Section 278 highway agreement to be entered into with the Highway Authority. The funding and installation/construction costs will come entirely from the applicant/developer.

2) Construction/demolition works shall be confined to the following hours.

- Monday - Friday: 7.30am - 6pm;
- Saturday: 8.30am - 2pm; and
- Sunday / Bank holidays: no work.

3) Given the basement element of the proposals, it is recommended that structural drawings and calculations for the temporary and permanent support works be submitted for checking (for a fee) to MCC Bridges/Structures Section in order to obtain an approval in principal.

4) Given that the building partially oversails an area of adopted highway, a Projection over License will be required for the application, obtainable via Contact Manchester on 0161 234 5004.

5) Bats - while the development proposal is low risk for bats, the applicant is reminded that under the Habitat Regulation it is an offence to disturb, harm or kill bats. If a bat is found all work should cease immediately and a suitably licensed bat worker employed to assess how best to safeguard the bat(s). Natural England should also be informed.

6) Biodiversity Enhancement - in line with Section 11 of the NPPF, we would recommend that opportunities for biodiversity enhancement be incorporated into the new development. These should include:

- Bat bricks and/or tubes within the new development;
- Bat boxes; and
- Bird boxes.

#### **Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

The documents referred to in the course of this report are either contained in the file(s) relating to application reference 116189/FO/2017 held by planning or are City Council planning policies, the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, national planning guidance documents, or relevant decisions on other applications or appeals, copies of which are held by the Planning Division.

#### **Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

The documents referred to in the course of this report are either contained in the file(s) relating to application ref: 116089/FO/2017 held by planning or are City Council planning policies, the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, national planning guidance documents, or relevant decisions on other applications or appeals, copies of which are held by the Planning Division.

#### **The following residents, businesses and other third parties in the area were consulted/notified on the application:**

Highway Services  
Environmental Health  
Corporate Property  
MCC Flood Risk Management  
Environment & Operations (Refuse & Sustainability)  
Travel Change Team  
Strategic Development Team  
Greater Manchester Police

United Utilities Water PLC  
Historic England (North West)  
Environment Agency  
Transport For Greater Manchester  
Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service  
Twentieth Century Society  
Ancient Monuments Society  
Council For British Archaeology  
Georgian Group  
Society For The Protection Of Ancient Buildings  
Victorian Society  
Wildlife Trust  
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit  
Greater Manchester Pedestrians Society

A map showing the neighbours notified of the application is attached at the end of the report.

**Representations were received from the following third parties:**

Highway Services  
Environmental Health  
MCC Flood Risk Management  
United Utilities Water PLC  
Historic England (North West)  
Transport For Greater Manchester  
Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service  
Victorian Society  
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit  
Flat 504, 83 high street, Manchester, M4 1be  
4 Laburnum Avenue, Chadderton, Oldham/Manchester, OL90EF  
Flat 108 Jewel House, 12 Thomas Street, Manchester, M4 1DH  
Flat 20, 2 Poland Street, Manchester, M4 6BR  
Apartment 706 Chatsworth House, 19 Lever Street, Manchester, M1 1BY  
Flat 1, Manchester, M4 1dz  
260 Milliners Wharf, 2 Munday Street, Manchester, M4 7BG  
29 Dundonald Rd, Manchester, M20 6RU  
27 Grosvenor Road, Whalley Range, M16 8JP  
22 Cromwell ave, Marple, sk6 6jq  
63 Rosebery Avenue, Boston, PE21 7QR  
23 Bramley Avenue, Stretford, Manchester, M329he  
Flat 214, Smithfield Buildings, 44 Tib Street, Manchester, M4 1LA  
Main st, Manchester, m359pd  
105 withington road, manchester, M16 8EE  
207 Jewel House, 12 Thomas street, Manchester, M4 1DH  
Flat 201, 12 Thomas Street, Manchester, M4 1DH  
41 Wycoller View, Colne, BB8  
45 Horton Road, Manchester, M14 7QB  
406, Market Buildings, 83 High Street, M4 1BE  
104 Market Buildings, Thomas street, Todmorden, M4 1EU


8 Stevenson Square, 1st Floor, Manchester, M1 1FB  
9 Liberty House, 77 Thomas Street, Manchester, M4 1LQ  
44 Rugby Road, Leigh, WN7 3HD  
49 Morse Road, Newton Heath, Manchester, M402sz  
Flat 10 Solmame House, 7 Union street, Manchester, M4 1PB  
5 melmerby court, eccles new road, salford, m5 4ug  
77 Thorn Court, Salford, M6 5EL  
Flat 9, 77 Thomas St, Manchester, M4 1LQ  
APARTMENT 414,, 87 HIGH STREET, MANCHESTER, M4 1BF  
34 Pickford Street, Manchester, M4 5BS  
Flat 3, 3 Beechtree Bank, Prestwich, M25 1BH  
Apartment 207, 12 Thomas Street, Manchester, M41Dh  
42 Jutland House, 15 Jutland Street, Manchester, M1 2BE  
Flat 7, Lancaster 80, Manchester, M1 yNF  
28 Rudyard Grove, Heaton Chapel, Stockport, Sk45nd  
18 Poplar Avenue, Manchestet, M19 2GS  
401 Agecroft House, 34 Copperas Street, Manchester, M4 1BJ  
137 Fog lane, Manchester, M20 6ED  
Apt 125 Smithfield Building, 44 Tib Street, Manchester, M4 1LA  
Flat 40, 31 lakeside rise, Manchester, M9 8QF  
12 Brocklebank Road, Manchester, M14 6EL  
30 warwick Road, manchester, m21 0ax  
Flat 707, The Birchin, 1 Joiner Street, Manchester, M4 1PH  
115 Smithfield Buildings, 44 Tib Street, Manchester, M4 1LA  
10 Thomas Street, Manchester, M4 1DH  
34 elmsleigh rd heald green, Manchester, SK8 3UE  
52 Jackson Crescent, Manchester, M15 5AA  
65 bexley hall, salford, m36dd  
25 broad oak lane, East didsbury, MANCHESTER, M20 5QB  
503A Langley Buildings, 53 Dale Street, Manchester, M1 2HH  
15 Northpoint House, 5 Edge Hill Street, Manchester, M4 1BB  
35 Shetland Place, Kirkcaldy, KY13DY  
Flat 12, 56 High Street, Manchester, M4 1ED  
9, Woollam Place, Castlefield, Manchester, M3 4JJ  
268 Wellington Rd South, Heaviley, Stockport, SK2 6ND  
11 New Street, Uppermill, OL36AU  
8 Heaton Street, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 1HP  
MC 606, 16 Jersey St, Mancehster, M4 6JA  
32 The Moss, Middleton, M24 1tf  
32, Brightwell walk Smithfield, Manchester, M41lz  
24 Len Cox Walk, Manchester, M4 5LA  
83 Egerton Road South, Manchester, m210yh  
12 Queens Court, 138 Palatine Road, Manchester, M20 3ZA  
Flat 1, 22 Turner Street, Manchester, M4 1  
100 Hall Street, Stockport, Sk14de  
210 Darley Avenue, Chorlton, M21 7JH  
Flat 11 Northpoint House, 5 Edgehill Street, Manchester, M1 1LQ  
204 Jewel House, 12 Thomas Street, Manchester, M4 1DH  
51 conmere square, Hulme, Manchester, M15 6de  
Flat 41, 23 Church Street, Manchester, M4 1PY

39 Hertford Road, Manchester, M9 8BW  
Apartment 10, 31 Tib Street, Manchester, M4 1JZ  
Flat 42, Roach Court Hamerton Road, Manchester, M40 7QP  
MC203, Royal Mills, 16 Jersey Street, Manchester, M4 6JA  
44 Knowsley house, Bolton, BL14bp  
Flat 4, Jutland House, 15 Jutland Street, Manchester, M1 2BE  
Apartment 4.3, The Design House, 108 High Street, Manchester, M4 1HT  
Basil Chambers, 65 High Street, Manchester, M4 1FS  
16 Beaumont Rd, Quarry, Oxford, OX3 8JN  
Apartment 504, 83 High Street, Manchester, M4 1BE  
306 Jewel House, 12 Thomas Street, Manchester, M4 1DH  
8 Woodfold Avenue, Manchester, M19 3AP  
20 Wilton Street, Manchester, M45 7EU  
16A Whittle Street, Manchester, M4 1LT  
Flat 18, Alexander Park House, Alexandra Road, Manchester, M16 8HU  
Flat 504, 83 High Street, Manchester, M4 1BE  
18 beechwood Ave, Chorlton, Manchester, M218uA  
39 Norwood Road, Stretford, Manchester, M32 8PN  
MC 606, 16 Jersey St, Manchester, M4 6JA  
Flat 204, 25 Church Street, Manchester, M4 1PE  
29 Lockton close, Manchester, M1 7jg  
55 All Saints Road, Stockport, Sk4 1qa  
Naples ST, Flat 11, Manchester, M4 4DH  
108 Jewel House, 12 Thomas Street, Manchester, M4 1DH  
12, Graver lane, Newton heath, M403hd  
57Whalley Road, Clitheroe, BB68EA  
Apartment 1102, 1 Kelso Place, Manchester, M15 4LE  
Flat 8 Liberty House, 75-77 Thomas street, Manchester, M4 1lq  
55 rose bank road, Newton Heath, Manchester, M402un  
87 Hermitage Road, Hale, WA15 8BW  
18 Old York St, Hulme, M15 5TE  
268 Cheetham Hill Road, Dukinfield, SK165JZ  
60 Hollinwood Rd, Disley, SK12 2EF  
Apartment 15, 23-25 Hilton Street, Manchester, M1 1EL  
Apartment 32, 76 Newton Street, Manchester, M11EU  
82 Stretford House, Chapel Lane,, Stretford, Manchester, M32 9AY  
40 Clifton Rd, Manchester, M25 3HQ  
208 agecroft house, 34 copperas Street, manchester, m4 1bj  
16 Cranswick St, Manchester, M14 7JA  
4.3 The Design House, 108 High Street, Manchester, M4 1HT  
6 Stephen Hunt street, Ancoats, Manchester, M4 6JX  
Flat 18 City Heights, Manchester, M1 7AX  
54 York Avenue, Whalley Range, MANCHESTER, M16 0AG  
122 Old Road, Manchester, M9 8BS  
105 Crow Hill South, Alkrington, Manchester, M24 1LA  
29 Gloucester Crescent, London, NW17DL  
21 Bodmin Road, Astley, Manchester, M29 7EZ  
Flat 43 Springbridge Court, 111 Springbridge Road, Manchester, M16 8HA  
21 Bankwell street, Manchester, M155LN  
31 David Street, Stockport, SK5 6BJ



407 The Birchin, 1 Joiner Street, Manchester, M4 1PH  
20 oak rd, Manchester, M203da  
25 Albion Street, Manchester, M16 9LZ  
27 Grosvenor Rd, Manchester, M16 8JP  
32 The Wentwood, 76 Newton Street, Manchester, M1 1EU  
75 Manor Road, Levenshulme, Manchester, M19 3EU  
5 Sandringham Road, Hazel Grove, Stockport, SK7 4RN  
6.4 Design House, Manchester, M4 1HT  
3 Heathbank road Cheadle Heath, Stockport, Sk3 0up  
3 Bredbury Road, Manchester, M14 7AG  
6 Whalley Avenue, Sale, M332BP  
86 broad oak lane, east didsbury, manchester, m205gg  
14 Turner street, Manchester, M4 1dz  
32 Langshaw Street, Manchester, M16 9LE  
17 Oak Street, Manchester, m4 5jd  
Flat 7, 4-6 Union St, Manchester, M4 1PT  
20 oak st, manchester, Manchester, m45je  
4 worthing st, Manchester, M14 7PR  
27 Cherry Walk, Cheadle Hulme, Cheadle, SK87DY  
16A Whittle Street, Manchester, M4 1LT  
55 All Saints road, Stockport, Sk4 1qa  
4 Longlevens Rd, Manchester, M22 1ba  
Flat 1, Harper House, Levenshulme, Manchester, M19 2AF  
Apt 110 Asia house, 82 princess st, Manchester, M1 6bd  
14 Russell Road, Manchester, M16 8DL  
15 Denison Road, Manchester, M14 5PB  
6 Holly Royde Close, Manchester, M203HR  
Flat 5, 22 Turner Street, Manchester, M4 1DZ  
flat 5, 22 Turner Street, Manchester, M41DZ  
24 Cherry Walk, Cheadle Hulme, Cheadle, SK8 7DY  
174, 154 Chapel Street, Salford, m3 6eu  
10, Thorneycroft Ave, Manchester, M21 7HT  
17 Milford Street, Cambridge, CB1 2LP  
6 Hartington Road, Chorlton, Manchester, M21 8UY

**Relevant Contact Officer :** Laurie Mentiplay  
**Telephone number :** 0161 234 4536  
**Email :** l.mentiplay@manchester.gov.uk



 Application site boundary    Neighbour notification  
© Crown copyright and database rights 2018. Ordnance Survey 100019568