

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS

**APPENDIX TO AGENDA
(LATE REPRESENTATIONS)**

**on planning applications to be considered by
the Planning and Highways Committee**

at its meeting on 17 December 2020

This document contains a summary of any objections or other relevant representations received by the Department since the preparation of the published agenda. Where possible, it will also contain the Director of Planning, Building Control & Licensing's own brief comment. These summaries are prepared on the day before the Committee. Very late responses therefore have to be given orally.

**APPENDIX TO AGENDA
(LATE REPRESENTATIONS)**

Planning and Highways Committee 17 December 2020

Item No. 5

Application Number 126912/FH/2020

Ward Crumpsall Ward

Description and Address

Erection of a two-storey side extension and a single storey rear extension together with the installation of a front dormer, including a Velux window and a dormer to the rear, porch and canopy to form additional living accommodation.

1C Ardern Road, Crumpsall, Manchester, M8 4WN

1. Consultation

Neighbourhood Services (Tree Section) were consulted on a tree survey that was carried out in response to concerns raised in relation to potential impact of the development on nearby trees. Neighbourhood services have raised no objection to the proposal, subject to careful construction methods being used whilst the development is implemented. In addition, they also recommend that the appointed arboricultural consultant should supervise the excavation element and ensure that adequate protection is in place to ensure root protection. An appropriate condition has been attached to ensure that this is the case.

2. Public Opinion

Two further objection letters have been received. A total of 8 objections have now been received to the most recent re-notification.

One of the letters introduces a new issue relating to the proposed front dormer suggesting that rooflights would be more appropriate.

The second letter raised no new issues that have not already been outlined in the letters that have summarised in the report.

3. Director of Planning – further comments and observations

The impact of the proposal on the trees is covered within the main body of the report.

The additional objection letters received do not raise any new issues. It is considered that the front dormer is appropriate and the reasons for this are set out within the main body of the report.

The report includes details on matters which are no longer included in the most up to date set of drawings submitted with this application. The issues section in the report states that the development includes block paving within the rear garden together

with the creation of a boundary wall. The report also states that the ground floor element of the side extension is flush with the original front elevation of the dwellinghouse and that the car parking area to the front of the property would remain unaffected.

The most up to date drawings submitted with the application seek to remove the boundary wall and significantly reduce the amount of hard landscaping within the rear garden. The ground floor element of the side extension also projects forward of the original front elevation of the dwelling to form an enlarged ground floor area in conjunction with the proposed front porch. The soft landscaping within the front garden reduces to allow an increased area for car parking. The proposal would include improvements to the front boundary treatment to screen the parking area which would be secured by condition 7.

The recommendation remains **Approve**

**APPENDIX TO AGENDA
(LATE REPRESENTATIONS)**

Planning and Highways Committee 17 December 2020

Item No. 6

Application Number 128191/FO/2020

Ward Ancoats & Beswick Ward

Description and Address

Erection of five office buildings and new public realm comprising: 3 no. 8 storey mixed use buildings (Buildings A, D and E) comprising workspaces (Use Class E) together with flexible uses at ground floor (Use Class E) and/or theatre/bar (Sui Generis) together with a multi use rooftop amenity area to Building A; and 2 no. 5 storey mixed use buildings (Buildings B and C) comprising workspaces (Use Class E) together with flexible uses at ground floor (Use Class E) and/or theatre/bar (Sui Generis); together with cycle parking, creation of pedestrian and cycle routes, external amenity spaces, new public realm and other associated engineering and infrastructure works

Land Bounded By Ashton Canal, Great Ancoats Street, Munday Street And Pollard Street, Manchester, M4 7DS

1. Public opinion

10 letters of support have been received raising the following points:

- 40% of the space would be affordable for start-ups/SMEs enabling them to remain close to the city centre;
- The spaces created would be conducive to collaboration with other businesses;
- The social value would forge an important relationship between tenants and the area in which they work strengthening sense of place and community. The social value package includes thousands of volunteer hours via an impact lease, skills seminars and free desk space;
- The technology sector is an important part of future economic growth in Manchester and across the North of England. This project would contribute to that;
- The scheme exceeds planning targets for carbon net zero, is car-free with 300% more cycle-spaces;
- Its quality would enhance Ancoats and New Islington's reputation. The office is particularly relevant given the anticipated demand for workspace post-pandemic, mixing the traditional office with home-working and more flexible workspaces;
- The £5 million invested in public realm would transform the area including community garden, children's play space and the opening up of 300 metres of the Ashton Canal together with walking and cycling improvements;
- The proposal would turn a brownfield site, which has been part of the city's long term plans for job creation, into a new community asset;

- The proposal would overcome well known problems associated with the area including drug taking, littering and anti-social behaviour. It would also make it safer and more secure in the evening for those using New Islington tram stop;
- The proposal is at the confluence of the City Centre and East Manchester. It is therefore a key part of the broader city's success;
- The economic stimulus is even more important due to the impact of coronavirus. The scheme would create 700 plus jobs during construction and thousands more once occupied. The development would promote further confidence in the area as a place to invest and continue to strengthen the economic engine of Greater Manchester;
- The development supports active travel and would improve air quality by planting 50 plus new trees, investing in green spaces and increasing biodiversity by 30%.

3 further objections have been received including one detailed objection from a local resident who has already commented on the proposal but believes the summary comments within the printed report do not reflect their detailed objections.

- This natural space should be left for the neighbourhood which is well used by the local community and has been a safe place for residents to use during the pandemic;
- Residents of the Hatbox will be deprived of sunlight and daylight and homes would not be compliant with the BRE guidelines;
- The Council should require the applicant to commission a further BRE study on the basis that the Bowlers Yard application has been approved near to the Hatbox which would also affect the light in the apartments;
- There is no reference in the report that a newt has been located within a short distance (less than 500m) of the site. A condition should require a newt survey of the neighbouring canal;
- The proposal is contrary to the local plan as it has not adequately taken into account the diverse character of New Islington and the mix between old and new properties. The green space in the site does not accord with the stated strategic direction of the Council in terms of reducing carbon, promoting health and wellbeing and ensuring new developments have appropriate landscaping within them;
- No consideration has been given to the effect of additional people on already stretched facilities such as the small Aldi supermarket at Urban Exchange and the PureGym at Urban Exchange;
- Whilst it is technically classified as "Brownfield" the site is covered in green grass for some years and is well used by the local community;
- It is the will of the people and local councillor who responded to the notification on this application that the proposal should be refused. The Council is the representative of the people and the Council should recognise that the majority of the people do not want this development to be approved;
- The use of the offices on a 24 hour/7 days a week basis would mean there is likelihood of noise, disturbance and light pollution which would affect residents living around Munday and Pollard Street. This would increase if more than one of the commercial units was occupied by a restaurant or bar;

- Munday Street is very small and already has to cope with traffic associated with Milliners Wharf and Hatbox. Additional servicing along this road would add to the pressure and have an impact on pedestrian safety;
- Waste storage is close to residential properties and would create odours and smells;
- Insufficient capacity at New Islington tram stop for the increased footfall in the area;
- There is insufficient disabled parking for the development;
- The height and scale is not acceptable against the historic environment or against Milliners Wharf and the Hatbox;
- The proposal will cause significant harm to residents of Hatbox Block A and Milliners Wharf. This high level of harm is unacceptable and the inadequate privacy distances between the new development would be bearing and privacy would be lost. This would impact on individuals' human rights.

2. Local Members

Councillor Majid Dar (Ancoats and Beswick)

Has been approached by many of the local residents, stating their dissent and objections to the earmarked development site through the Eastland's Regeneration Framework.

The residents feel that the space being proposed for the development will hugely impact their leisure and recreational pursuits and their appreciation of their value for the open spaces is very strongly emphasised in their communications and conversation with him and the other local councillors of the area.

Cllr Dar strongly support their concerns as many of the residents hold community walks, picnic's, socialise within their local environment and it creates a strong bond between them as residents, improving their mental health (self-isolation is reduced) and all aspects of their wellbeing tremendously.

Residents do state that they agree new developments are essential in this day and age, however not to the size of the suggested space which is involved which they feel is very excessive and overindulgent, in consideration to the local community's needs.

Cllr Dar fully support all their concerns, comments and feels they have many strong points to realise my objection to the planning application on their behalf.

3. Director of Planning

The report provides a detailed consideration of the relevant planning issues including the proposals contribution to regeneration.

A comprehensive daylight and sunlight assessment has considered the effect on windows and rooms overlooking the site and the results are not unusual in this context. The privacy distances to nearby developments would not impact unduly on daylight, sunlight or privacy that could warrant refusal.

Great Manchester Ecology Unit advise that there are no known ecological reasons why the site cannot be redeveloped. Conditions are recommended about when vegetation clearance works can take place to protect existing habitats together with biodiversity improvements.

Highway Services consider the servicing arrangements, level of parking for disabled people and promotion of active travel and new walking and cycling routes to be acceptable.

The development is not expected to generate significant levels of noise and the waste management arrangements are acceptable. Conditions would minimise any harm from the commercial uses.

Following further consultation with Metrolink, condition 26 should be omitted from the list of planning conditions.

The recommendation remains **Approve**.

**APPENDIX TO AGENDA
(LATE REPRESENTATIONS)**

Planning and Highways Committee 17 December 2020

Item No. 7

Application Number 122280/FO/2019

Ward Deansgate Ward

Description and Address

Erection of new mixed-use development to comprise of one 10 storey building fronting Mirabel Street to accommodate 45 no. Use Class C3 residential apartments (9 no. 1-bed studios, 27 no. 2-bed 3 person apartments and 9 no. 2-bed 4 person apartments) and 8 no. residential car parking spaces at ground level and one part 10, part 14 storey building fronting Great Ducie Street to accommodate 84 no. Use Class C3 residential apartments (31 no. 1-bed 2 person apartments, 26 no. 2-bed 3 person apartments, 18 no. 2-bed 4 person apartments and 9 no. 3-bed 5 person apartments) and 345 sq. m of commercial floor space at ground level (flexible use Use Class A1 shop, Use Class A2 financial and professional services and Use Class A3 cafe/restaurant) together with creation of roof terrace amenity space, cycle parking, access, servicing and associated works following demolition of existing building

Land Bounded By Great Ducie Street And Mirabel Street, Manchester, M3 1PJ

1. Elected Members

An objection has been received from Councillor Marcus Johns on behalf of the 3 Deansgate ward members. The main points raised in the objection are below:

It is overdevelopment - 129 apartments on 0.12ha is overdevelopment in this location. It is tightly enclosed on all sides and the relatively low-rise existing structure and open nature of part of the site provide relief for this. The proposals are excessive and overbearing.

It is too tall and fails to meet the requirements of Core Strategy Policy EN2 - The proposal is too tall and does not accord with Policy EN2 because it is not of excellent design quality, is not appropriately located, fails to contribute positively to place making and brings significant regeneration disbenefits on the setting of previous regeneration on Mirabel Street. The grey massing would rise above the heritage railway bridges, which are in the process of restoration, and intrude on the setting of the Cathedral and its conservation area 50 metres away. A distinctive stepping down from Greengate in Salford to the Arena is evident. Tempus Tower is part of this narrative but is stepped back from the dense part of Mirabel Street and more appropriately positioned toward Trinity Way, where the building fits its setting. The proposal 'stepping up' in the middle of this narrative would harm the setting of the heritage assets on Mirabel Street including the former Parcel Office, by setting them in a steep canyon where their architecture cannot be enjoyed, as well as harming the

setting of the railway bridges. This would harm the unique, attractive and distinctive Manchester skyline and approach views.

It would cause considerable overlooking and is not designed to give privacy both to its residents and neighbours in accordance with Policy H1 of the Core Strategy - It is significantly higher than the existing residential accommodation in the Bay Building and Beaumont Building. This and the roof-top amenity space, would create significant overlooking from a high number of apartments at all times. It would result in a loss of privacy which does not accord with Policy H1.

It does not appropriately reflect the character of the area, failing to adhere to Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy - It is a grey-clad building in a neighbourhood of red brick which would fail to enhance the heritage assets on Mirabel Street and the railway bridges. The proposal would fundamentally alter the character of existing residences on Mirabel and Breslyn Streets which are lower in height and are appreciated from Great Ducie Street. The proposal suggests a refuse space, service access and parking entrance opposite existing residential accommodation, harming their setting. The Design & Access Statement states that Tempus Tower acts as a marker for the intersection of Mirabel Street and Trinity Way. This development would confuse this articulation, cause harm to the existing architectural narrative and terminate a pleasant view of Manchester Cathedral's tower from Trinity Way/Great Ducie Street.

It harms the setting of heritage assets and does not meet the requirements of Policy CC9 - The proposal harms the setting of the Cathedral and its Conservation Area. The former Parcel Office is a heritage asset and the existing residential development on Mirabel Street was undertaken in a complementary and respectful way to this heritage. These regeneration efforts would be undone and harmed by the height, colour palette, massing, and lack of architectural detail of the proposal. Policy CC9 is clear that development should preserve or enhance heritage assets and should complement them. The grey palette would create an unpleasant grey mass as the dominating narrative and not reflect or meld with existing red-brick heritage assets and residential development on Mirabel Street.

It would strain local roads and adversely affect the pedestrian environment - The proposal during construction and upon completion and occupation would place strain on local roads. The transport statement does not reference taxis, private hire vehicles, on-demand transport services, food/take-away delivery or online shopping deliveries which for 129 apartments would have a significant impact on Breslyn Street and Mirabel Street particularly. The proposal includes no layby or parking space for these. Existing residents already regularly complain about congestion. Breslyn Street is tight and narrow, but the proposal suggests it is an appropriate street for service/maintenance access and emergency exit routes. This is inappropriate and raises concerns about the accessibility of emergency vehicles to existing and proposed developments. On Mirabel Street, the parking entrance and service/maintenance access directly across from existing dwellings would cause noise, odour, and other nuisances and would add a dropped curb very close to the Breslyn Street/Mirabel Street junction. This would further add to existing traffic problems on Mirabel Street. The transport statement does not reflect on these issues appropriately. The proposal would harm pedestrian routes and the pedestrian

environment on Breslyn Street by creating a steep canyon and reducing sightlines, promoting crime and reducing safety with respect to vehicles. The proposal includes very narrow pavements. The pedestrian routes along Mirabel Street would be severed by another parking access point in close proximity to an existing junction, creating a stressful experience for pedestrians and more route conflicts where accidents can occur.

It would promote crime and anti-social behaviour - By enclosing the narrow Breslyn Street on two sides with tall development, crime and antisocial behaviour will be promoted, as Breslyn Street would become dark, with limited sightlines.

It does not address existing and future deficiencies in physical, social and green infrastructure in accordance with Policy H1 - It does not contribute to the city centre community by way of social or green infrastructure, despite Policy H1. It results in the loss of open space, which provides sightlines across Breslyn Street/Mirabel Street and replaces it all with built form. There is no contribution to much needed green space on-site or off-site. There is no contribution to public amenity of services, no attempt to estimate social impact and no acknowledgement of the future services needs of residents. It would place additional pressure on already under-pressure public services (eg patients at local GPs) but does not acknowledge this or attempt to mitigate it, and this will harm existing residents.

It fails to meet Core Strategy Policy H8 and mixed communities (H1) - The importance of mixed communities is stressed by Policy H1 and does not exclude those of different income groups. Policy H8 requires that new development contributes to the City-wide target of 20% of new housing provision. The proposal provides no on-site affordable housing units and makes no off-site contribution, so fails both policies in this regard. The financial viability assessment does not demonstrate that it is viable to deliver only a proportion of the 20% target, but instead provides a weak argument that does not accord with national policy as to why it should deliver 0%. The Viability Assessment tests the proposed development against a market return 17.5%, which it claims is a reduced profit margin, but the 2019 Planning Practice Guidance allows for 15 to 20% gross development value to be considered a suitable return. The assessment therefore understates the viability of the scheme and does so as a tool to reduce potential for S106 or affordable housing contributions, despite the harm caused by the proposal. The proposed development also does not meet the remaining circumstances outlined in Policy H8 whereby intermediate or social rented housing would be inappropriate.

2. Public/Local Opinion

One further objection has been received from a local resident. The main issues raised are summarised below:

- The land needs to be developed but the current proposal falls below expectations.
- The materials aren't in keeping with immediate surroundings and its predominately red brick theme. The proposal of a dominant 10 storey grey palette building is totally out of keeping and not aesthetically pleasing. In response to neighbour comments, the developers have deliberately

overplayed the use of accents on existing residential buildings to justify the current grey palette choice and referenced non-residential buildings in the area to justify the choice of materials.

- The use of white rendering on the top of the proposed building requires significant upkeep in order to keep clean. There are examples of other nearby developments that show how white exterior walls can become an eyesore if not appropriately maintained. These concerns were raised by neighbours but there have been no notifiable amendments to the aesthetics to address these concerns.
- The size of the building will significantly impact the amount of light that makes its way into the Bay Building (which is already limited due to the viaduct and Manchester Arena). Following the Coronavirus Pandemic, it is likely more people will continue to work from home so it is vital that enough light is received into the homes of nearby residents for our mental health and to have a vibrant environment to spend the majority of our working days. The current proposals will block out what little light we already get into our home. Again, these concerns were raised by neighbours but the developer's response was to say that the Bay Building has balconies which adversely affect daylight sunlight results as the windows and rooms behind those balconies will be largely reliant on horizontal light (thus over burdening a nearby development). My flat in the Bay Building does not have a balcony and is only partially blocked by a retained facade. The implication from the developer that the choice of having a balcony means that the lack of daylight is inevitable is not completely fair to residents.
- The developer quotes the BRE guide mentioning a flexible approach for new developments. A flexible approach does not mean that the concerns of neighbours in the immediate area should be ignored but that developers may not be able to avoid some impacts on daylight for other residential buildings when a new development is constructed. Has the developer sought to minimize the impact of the development and have they explored solutions to ensure the impact on daylight for local residents is minimal? It is assumed not as reducing the number of storeys would have been a start.

3. Director of Planning – Further Observations / Modifications to Conditions

1. The economic benefits of the proposal are summarised below:

At the site as existing, there are an assumed 10 full time equivalent (FTE) direct jobs associated with the existing studios and 1.5 FTE direct jobs associated with the car parking.

For the proposal, the calculations are based on the estimated costs for the development of £23.92m excluding VAT. This is based on 129 new apartments and 334.5 sqm of mixed-use commercial space.

Assuming a 1.5-year build period, there would be 92 FTE construction jobs on-site and a further 137 off-site indirect FTE jobs. The GVA associated with these jobs would be £14.7m per year (£22.05m over the total construction period). A high proportion of the jobs and GVA would be retained in the North West.

The housing would accommodate 297 residents with 209 additional working age residents and an additional £2.3m of expenditure to the local economy. This could directly support 18.8 FTE jobs within local shops in Manchester. The GVA associated with these jobs would be £440,000 per year.

Assuming Band D Council tax, the 129 new homes would generate £220,000 per annum for the Council. New homes bonus would provide an additional £900,000 over 4 years.

The additional 297 residents would support 54 public sector jobs across public administration, education and health.

The commercial accommodation is estimated to create 18.6 jobs with annual GVA of £570,000 per year. An estimated 16.5 jobs (direct and induced) and GVA of £370,000 would be lost from the site based on its current occupation (small studios and car parking). Therefore, the net jobs (new jobs less those lost on site) would be 2.5 FTE with annual GVA of £200,000.

2. 2 additional conditions are proposed:

Condition 34

a) 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 the 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.

b) 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 Council as local planning authority.

In the event that ground contamination, groundwater contamination and/or ground gas, not previously identified, are found to be present on the site at any

time before the development is occupied, then development shall cease and/or the development shall not be occupied until, a report outlining what measures, if any, are required to remediate the land (the Revised Remediation Strategy) is submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance 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 policies DM1 and EN18 of the Core Strategy.

Condition 35

Prior to first occupation of the building, the applicant shall provide a commitment, to be agreed with the City Council, as local planning authority, that ensures that the parking needs of all disabled guests are met at a reasonable cost.

Reason - To ensure that the requirements of disabled guests are met in relation to parking and access, pursuant policies T1, T2 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

3. Condition 2 shall be amended as follows:

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

Access Arrangements Plan
Accommodation Schedule
Affordable Housing Statement
Air Quality Assessment
Archaeological Desktop Assessment Report
Baseline TV Signal Survey and TV Reception Impact Assessment
Broadband Connectivity Assessment
Certificate of Ownership and Notification
Commercial Delivery Statement
Crime Impact Statement
Daylight and Sunlight Report
Demolition and Construction Methodology Report
Demolition Plan
Design and Access Statement
Ecological Survey Report
Energy Statement and Environmental Standards Statement
Environmental Noise Report
Fire Engineering Report
Flood Risk Assessment
Framework Travel Plan
Heritage Assessment
Phase 1 Desk Based Ground Conditions Report

Planning and Tall Building Statement
Planning Application Form
Residential Management Strategy Statement
Response to the Manchester Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy
Servicing and Site Waste Management Strategy
Statement of Consultation
Street Tree Planting Strategy
Transport Statement
Travel Plan
TV Reception Survey
Utility Statement
Ventilation Strategy
Ventilation Strategy
Viability Appraisal
Wind Engineering Desktop Study

Drawings

Location Plan L(--)-150 Rev A
North Elevation / Section BB L(SK)201 Rev B
Typical Floor Layout (Level 01-02) L(--)-001 Rev A
Typical Floor Layout (Level 03 -04) L(--)-003 Rev A
Typical Floor Layout (Level 05 -09) L(--)-005 Rev A
Proposed Floor Layout (Level 10) L(--)-010 Rev A
Typical Floor Layout (Level 11 -13) L(--)-011 Rev A
Roof Plan Layout L(--)-014 Rev A
North Elevation / Section AA L(--)-200 Rev B
Proposed Site Plan L(--)-101 Rev A

all received by the Local Planning Authority on 19 March 2020

East Elevation as proposed L(--)-202
East Elevation / Section CC L(--)-203
South Elevation as proposed L(--)-204
West Elevation as proposed L(--)-205
West Elevation / Section DD L(--)-206
Façade Study 1 L(--)-210
Façade Study 2 L(--)-211
Façade Study 3 L(--)-212
Façade Study 4 L(--)-213
Façade Study 5 L(--)-214
Façade Study 6 L(--)-215
Façade Study 7 L(--)-216

all received by the Local Planning Authority on 26 February 2019

Ground Floor Layout L(--)-000 Rev E

received by the Local Planning Authority on 19 October 2020

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

**APPENDIX TO AGENDA
(LATE REPRESENTATIONS)**

Planning and Highways Committee 17 December 2020

Item No. 11

Application Number 128018/FO/2020

Ward Didsbury West
Ward

Description and Address

Erection of a part three, part four storey building to provide 34 retirement apartments with associated communal facilities, landscaping and car parking following the demolition of the existing dwelling

Jessiefield, Spath Road, Manchester, M20 2TZ.

1. Ward Member

Councillor Richard Kilpatrick – After meeting with local residents would urge the planning department to refuse this application due to the impact on local amenity and overdevelopment.

The site of Jessiefield is located on Spath Road between Dene Road West and Lancaster Road. The site is currently a family home with access from Spath Road, although the plans note a slight change in the access this section of the road is a soft blind corner and increase traffic on the site it would add additional parking and access pressures to a section of highways that already suffers from being a “rat run” from West Didsbury to Didsbury Village. The access to the site of the number of vehicles would be unsafe and cause highways issues for local residents that would qualify as a loss of amenity.

The proposed building itself is aimed at 55+ and in the model of many McCarthy and Stone properties elsewhere in the city. It is claimed that residents will not use cars and thusly the parking is proficient, an assumption which should be challenged. The flats would be targeted at high value residents downsizing. It should be assumed that residents would still be using cars to visit local district centres and further afield. Failure to provide at least one car parking space for each flat would cause a serious amount of parking issues in the area. In particular the impact on parking on Spath Road and Lancaster Road between Barlow Moor Road and Spath Road and the section of Lancaster Road from Spath Road and Dene Road. In both sections the road at Lancaster Road is unadopted and currently have some serious surface defects. Parking issues in this area will be very difficult to remedy. Furthermore, the parking on the location does not factor in additional traffic such as visitors, deliveries, carers etc. In summary the parking is insufficient and the impact that would have on the area would be a serious loss of amenity.

The building itself would see the loss of the current building which is in keeping with the local area. Although the area is not a conservation area the importance of

keeping the area in keeping and preserving local heritage is important to local residents. The height of the building would cause severe oversight on nearby properties and would have a major impact on the character of Lancaster Road which does not have a block of flats of this nature on the southern section of the road.

The size of the current development increased the footprint on the land. The increase in footprint will result in the increased loss of natural drainage in the area. Any additional pressure on local drainage would be adding to a gully system that is already over capacity.

Access to the site can be made from Dene Road West – Holme Road or from Dene Road to Lancaster or Spath Road. In all of these examples there has been recent work to fix the potholes and resurfacing either by residents (where the road is unadopted) or by the council. Heavy vehicles accessing the site would worsen the condition of local roads.

The Councillor support the representations of local residents on the basis of loss of amenity due to additional highways pressure, impact on parking in the area due to insufficient parking provision and general over development.

If the council should be recommended for approval conditions to pay for either the adoption of unadopted roads or works to the road and for provision for work to address the amenity loss detailed. This would include highways work to Lancaster Road, traffic calming measures on Spath Road. In previous applications on this site underground parking services had been required – this should be a minimum requirement on this site. Furthermore any development on this site should include hedgehog friendly fencing, bat bricks and swift boxes and the council should ensure that tree protection orders are updated to preserve the natural amenity of the site.

2. Highways

Following the comments of Highways, the applicant made submissions to address concerns raised. Highways have responded to further information provided as follows:

Whilst Highways welcome the additional construction related information contained in the revised method statement provided, they would still recommend that a Demolition and Construction Management Plan be conditioned as part of any planning approval. It is now understood that refuse collection will be from the public highway rather than from the development forecourt thus avoiding the necessity for the waste collection vehicle to enter the site. This arrangement is acceptable in principle to Highways. In relation to the revised vehicle access, the visibility splays provided are acceptable to from a highway perspective.

3. Applicant

The applicant submitted a schedule of the proposed unit sizes as requested to confirm that the proposed units meet residential space standards.

4. Director of Planning

The additional comments received do not raise any further issues to those addressed within the original report to committee.

The further comments from Highways and the applicant whilst offering clarity do not alter the reasons for refusal previously recommended.

The recommendation of the Director of Planning is to **REFUSE**