

**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 28 July 2022**

**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** 28 July 2022

**Item No.** 5

**Application Number** 133746/FO/2022

**Ward** Didsbury East  
Ward

### **Description and Address**

Erection of a 6-storey residential building (Use Class C3) comprising 75 no. apartments together with ground floor residential amenity space, landscaping, cycle parking, car parking and associated works, space, car parking, cycle parking as well as landscaping, highways and other associated works

Land Junction of Parrs Wood Lane, Manchester, M20 5AA

---

### **1. Further representations**

Three further comments have been received from residents, these raise issues around traffic congestion, air quality, that the applicant is not signed up to the government's Building Safety Repair Pledge (last updated on 8<sup>th</sup> July 2022), and the density of proposed development at the site. These matters are considered within the published report.

### **2. Applicant**

The applicant's agent has provided a response to the matters of concern raised by the report and in the reasons for refusal.

They contend that the proposal is consistent with the Council's planning policy as well as that contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. They believe the proposals are consistent with policy H6 and that the policy is not intended to preclude development outside of District Centres. They contend that the proposal would provide 15 no. affordable homes (consistent with policy), thereby adding to the stock of affordable housing and meeting the requirements of policy H6. They refer to a recent appeal inspector decision for the proposed development at Oakley that they believe supports their policy position.

In responding to concerns around the transport data and surveys undertaken. The agent indicates that these were undertaken at a time when no coronavirus lockdowns or measures were in place (September 2021).

The applicant contends that the level of car parking provision in the scheme is suitable and acceptable for the site given its location and the profile of the typical occupier of a build to rent scheme.

### **3. Response of the Director of Planning**

As set out within the published report the proposals are not considered to accord with the policy framework in place for the city generally and specifically the South Manchester area. The scheme is of a high density and whilst the proposals would contribute to affordable housing stock in the form of 15 units for affordable rent this is not considered to overcome the concerns with this form of development at this location.

As confirmed in the response of the Health and Safety Executive the proposed building is not of a height that triggers the requirement for statutory consultation or response from them in relation to this application or the preparation of a Fire Risk Statement.

The recommendation of the Director of Planning remains to **REFUSE** the application.

## **APPENDIX TO AGENDA (LATE REPRESENTATIONS)**

**Planning and Highways Committee** 28 July 2022

**Item No.** 7

**Application Number** 132489/FO/2021

**Ward** Piccadilly Ward

### **Description and Address**

Erection of a part-34, part-11, part 9, part 7 storey residential building above semi-basement level, with associated residents' amenity space including gym (Use Class C3) (comprising 485 dwellings), commercial space (Use Class E), basement car parking (47 spaces), cycle parking (485 spaces) landscaping, and other associated works

Port Street, Manchester M1 2EQ

---

### **1. The Public/Local Opinions**

Royal Mills Residents Association would support a lower building. They reiterate their original objection and would prefer to see a lower and sympathetic development. Recent nearby developments at 15 storeys have balanced profit and aesthetics.

The City Council have encouraged families and people of all ages to live here and the population has grown since 2017 but many are already looking to move out. This would impact on people's mental health and wellbeing. The fact that children will be collected in its shadow is saddening and concerning. The 210 objections do not include those who didn't object formally as believed this to be a "fait accompli".

They note the relationship of this proposal and the Piccadilly Basin SRF to The Astley and Oxid House approved in 2015 and 2016. The SRF does not consider the context of surrounding buildings in the same way as the design development process on these developments as reflected in the supporting documentation. These applications establish a precedent for development from Ancoats to blend and compliment the mills, not dwarf them. This clashes with the 33-storey building. The strategic planning policies are not aligned. The developer agrees as taller tower is at the rear of this site.

A representation from Brownsfield Mill (Avro) Residents Committee notes that 250 objections had been received but only one party attended the last meeting. The main concern is height but if the developer loses one storey the scheme would be approved. This is very difficult to understand as substantial material objections will be ignored. None of their arguments appear to have been taken into account. They request a fair hearing. The development will be detrimental to Avro which would be completely overshadowed.

A letter of support states that Rental demands are sky high in the area and the surface car park has been a blot on the area for decades. Get it built.

## **2. Director of Planning - Further Observations**

The SRF notes the pattern of taller buildings on Great Ancoats Street at key intersections and nodal points, and an opportunity for heights to step up towards Great Ancoats Street, culminating at its junction with Port Street. This route is at a key intersection connecting Piccadilly to Ancoats, New Islington and beyond. All objections have been addressed in the Committee Report.

**APPENDIX TO AGENDA  
(LATE REPRESENTATIONS)**

**Planning and Highways Committee** 28 July 2022

**Item No.** 8

**Application Number** 130922/FO/2021

**Ward** Piccadilly Ward

**Description and Address**

Erection of 4 no. part 4, part 5 storey, three-bedroom townhouses (Use Class C3) with associated car / cycle parking, recessed balconies and rooftop terraces.

Land South of Stables Car Park, Paradise Wharf, Ducie Street, Manchester, M1 2JN

---

**1. Ward Members**

Councillor Wheeler expressed concerns about how the application has been publicised to residents, particularly the prominence and placement of site notices and states that this is an issue that should be addressed in the future.

He also believes the development is broadly in-keeping with its surroundings and believes that any disruption caused will be worked out with affected residents.