

**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 22 August 2019**

**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** 22 August 2019

**Item No.** 6

**Application Number** 121857/FO/2018

**Ward** Hulme Ward

**Description and Address**

Erection of a twelve-storey purpose built student accommodation building with three storey element to rear comprising 82 units with roof top terrace and associated landscape and highway works, following demolition of existing structures

84 Cambridge Street, Manchester, M15 6BP

---

**1. Further resident's comments**

A petition signed by 87 residents has been received objecting to the application on the following grounds: Daylight reductions below recommended levels; massive overshadowing, overlooking and loss of privacy inside properties and gardens; no provision for adequate means of access for increased traffic generation due to servicing the building or parking which would compromise safety; noise, disturbance and anti-social behaviour of such a dense population of teenagers on local elderly and child residents.

Three further comments have been received from residents a summary of the comments are:

The land to the rear of the site over which it is suggested the building will be serviced via Chervil Close, including deliveries, refuse collections and the arrivals and departures of nearly 100 students is a very small area of private land for residents use, including as a play area for many local young children. This proposal would not only damage this amenity but is a potential hazard to these children from road traffic.

Policy H1 refers to high density developments being proposals with over 75 units per hectare and that there is precedence for this measure being used to evaluate the excessive density of a proposal, reference is given to a refusal of a proposal for the redevelopment of the Former Game Cock pub on Boundary Lane in pub that was refused permission in 2012. In addition, the objector states:

- the proximity of the proposed building to the existing residents front door has not changed.
- the overall height of the building has not reduced, leaving an overly tall building on a very small site.
- the shadowing and proximity to the building to the north of the site has not been addressed at all
- the existing level of amenity in the immediate locality is already under significant pressure and the addition of more residents will only damage this further.

- the current building is being lived in at present and is not vacant, derelict or beyond repair and it does not attract any antisocial behaviour (see attached photo)

Many of the developer's attempts to deflect criticism about the negative impacts of the development are reliant on management policy, such measures should not be taken into consideration without the existence of matching by laws to provide any degree of confidence that management policy is retained, complied with, enforced, and policed.

## **2. Applicant**

The applicant wished to set out that they had undertaken a further period of engagement since proposals were previously considered by Committee at its meeting held on the 11 April 2019.

The applicant states that the purpose of the further engagement has been to inform the revisions to the development proposals, as well as exploring ways in which the development and the applicant could deliver additional benefits for the local community. Both of these areas reflected the concerns raised by Members and local residents at the previous committee meeting in April. The applicant feels that it would be helpful for Members to be made aware of this further engagement before they consider the application.

In summary, the further engagement has included:

- Meeting with local ward councillors Cllr Murphy and Cllr Wright
- Additional meeting with Cllr Wright and local residents to discuss how the scheme could benefit the community. These discussions then lead to further discussions with One Manchester.
- Meeting with One Manchester to formalise partnership discussions and the terms of the 'community benefit fund'.
- Further meeting / discussions with Manchester Metropolitan University

In addition, the applicant has provided a copy of a letter sent to them from One Manchester which discusses a scheme to deliver community benefit projects in conjunction with the applicant.

In response to the matter raised by the resident regarding access, the applicant has confirmed that the proposed approach to servicing has been discussed with MCC Highway Services and the relevant third party landowner. Subject to a positive outcome at committee, further detailed discussions will continue between the three parties to conclude discussions and agree the most appropriate strategy

## **3. Director of Planning - Further observations/comments**

The matters raised by residents in the late petition have been fully assessed and considered within the printed Committee report.

A question has been raised with regards to precedence for not accepting high density development on a site elsewhere in Hulme. For clarification policy H1 relates to

residential developments and states “High density developments (over 75 units per hectare) are appropriate in both the City Centre and parts of the Regional Centre given the accessible location.” In this instance policy H12 is the relevant policy to consider this proposals for purpose built student accommodation and a full assessment against this policy is set out within the printed report and concludes that the proposed density and form of development in this location is considered to be acceptable.

In addition to the matter raised by the resident with regards to access for servicing and arriving students to the proposals there are two proposed conditions numbers 14 and 16 which require an access strategy for moving in / out days and a detailed servicing strategy (including refuse collection), respectively, to be submitted and approved in writing prior to first occupation.

An amendment is required to proposed condition number 2 to ensure correct drawing revisions are referenced. The corrected condition is set out below.

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

Plan – Level 0 – PL010 Rev B Plan – Level 1 – PL011 Rev A Plan – Level 2 – PL012 Rev A Plan – Level 3 – PL013 Rev A Plan – Level 4 – PL014 Rev A Plan – Level 5 – PL015 Rev A Plan – Level 6 – PL016 Rev A Plan – Level 7 – PL017 Rev A Plan – Level 8 – PL018 Rev A Plan – Level 9 – PL019 Rev A Plan – Level 10 – PL020 Rev A Plan – Level 11 – PL021 Rev B Plan – Level 12 – PL022 Rev B Elevation East – PL030 Rev A Elevation South – PL031 Rev B Elevation West – PL032 Rev B Elevation North - PL033 Rev A Section A-A – PL040 Rev B Section B-B – PL041 Rev B Section C-C – PL042 Rev A Section D-D – PL043 Rev A Section E-E – PL044 Rev B Design & Access Statement prepared by Carson & Partners (May 2019) Daylight and Sunlight Report prepared by Consil (Version 1, 14 June 2019) Crime Impact Statement prepared by Greater Manchester Police (Version B, 24 May 2019) Transport Statement Prepared by TPA May 2019 1804-05/TS/02 Framework Travel Plan Prepared by TPA May 2019 1804-05/TP/02 BREEAM New Construction: Pre-Assessment Report prepared by RPS dated 28 May 2019 Baseline Television Signal Survey & Television Reception Impact Assessment, prepared by GTech Surveys (Version 2.0, 22 May 2019) Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Strategy prepared by Conisbee (Version 1.3, 23 May 2019) Drainage Strategy, prepared by Conisbee 161045-CON-X-00-DR-C1000 Rev P3 Sustainable Drainage Maintenance Plan, prepared by Conisbee (Version 1.0, 23 July 2018) Wind Microclimate Assessment - Design Review prepared by RWDI (ref. RWDI#18033425) Noise Assessment Report prepared by Cundall dated 24 May 2019 Management Plan prepared by Homes for Students dated May 2019 External Lighting Strategy – SK\_E001 Waste Management Plan dated 15/11/2018 Heritage Statement prepared by Stephen Levrant Heritage Associates dated July 2018 Ground and Contamination Investigation Summary prepared by Conisbee dated September 2018 Phase 1 Geo-Environment Desk Study prepared by Wardell Armstrong dated February 2017 Phase 2 Site Investigation Report prepared by Ground Engineering Limited dated September 2018 Arboricultural Impact Assessment prepared by TEP dated October 2018 Ventilation Strategy prepared by Cundall dated 24 October 2018 The Impact of Higher Education on the Economy of Manchester prepared by Alumno Group dated 30 October 2018 Student Accommodation – Church Inn, Manchester prepared by

Alumno Group dated 30 October 2018 Statement of Community Involvement prepared by Lexington Communications North dated August 2018 Planning Statement prepared by GL Hearn dated November 2018 Energy Statement prepared by Cundall dated 26 October 2018 Ecological Assessment prepared by TEP dated May 2018 Broadband Connectivity Assessment prepared by Cundall dated 29 October 2018 Bluetooth low energy beacons for Church Inn, Manchester prepared by Danny Ball dated 25 October 2018 Air Quality Assessment prepared by Cundall dated 25 October 2018 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

In addition, an amendment is required to proposed condition number 20 for the submission and approval of a waste management scheme for the proposal that includes details for the storage and disposal of organic waste.

The recommendation remains to **APPROVE** the application.

**APPENDIX TO AGENDA  
(LATE REPRESENTATIONS)**

<b>Planning and Highways Committee</b>	22 August 2019	<b>Item No.</b>	7
<b>Application Number</b>	123274/FO/2019	<b>Ward</b>	Rusholme Ward

**Description and Address**

Erection of a 2 storey teaching block and re-arrangement of the associated car park  
Xaverian College, Lower Park Road, Manchester, M14 5RB

---

**1. Further comments from applicant**

Further to the printed report to committee, Xaverian College recognise the committee's concerns regarding a loss of view and would welcome the opportunity to potentially provide alternative views across the open space towards the Listed Buildings on the College campus, if desired by Committee.

Xaverian College are willing to create a new opening in the existing wall along Dagenham Road (by reducing the wall height in parts and infilling with metal railing instead). This will open up new, improved beneficial views, whilst maintaining the open nature of the College Green.

Xaverian College would be happy to explore this opportunity further through discussion and consultation with ward members.

**2. Director of Planning - Further observations/comments**

The further comments from the College are welcomed. The Council as local planning authority is currently considering proposals from the college to undertake works to the boundary walls around the College Campus (planning application reference 123188/FO/2019) including those that are referred to in the Colleges response on Regent Place. Whilst these proposals are subject to separate consideration from the current application they do offer the opportunity to provide additional views into the campus, any revised proposals put forward would be subject to further resident notifications and further reporting to this Committee for resolution.

If committee are minded to approve the application amendments are required to the following conditions:

Condition 3:

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.

In addition, a minor amendment is required to condition 12 to read:

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 shall be implemented in full before the use commences.

Upon completion of the development a verification report will be required to validate that the work undertaken throughout the development conforms to the recommendations and requirements in the approved acoustic consultant's report. The report shall also undertake post completion testing to confirm that acceptable criteria has been met. Any instances of non-conformity with the recommendations in the report shall be detailed along with any measures required to ensure compliance with the agreed noise criteria.

The recommendation remains to **APPROVE** the application.

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

**Planning and Highways Committee** 22 August 2019

**Item No.** 10

**Application Number** 123748/FO/2019

**Ward** Withington Ward

### **Description and Address**

Erection a part 3, part 7 and part 10 storey building, plus a basement level, to accommodate biomedical research laboratories, consultant workspace, collaboration spaces, and an ancillary café, together with external storage and servicing compound, cycle storage facility, external hard and soft landscaping, and plant and equipment.

The site of the fire damaged Paterson Building on Wilmslow Road and north of Oak Road, Christie Hospital NHS Trust, 550 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M20 4BX

---

### **1. Local Residents/Public Opinion**

**Local Residents** – An additional thirteen letters have been received which reiterate the objections contained within the committee report. One of the letters makes specific reference to air quality issues and these are reproduced below:

- There is a fundamental and inadequately-resolved issue with local air quality that dates from 2012.
- The issue of describing air quality at the site and determining the difference this development would introduce is being made more complex, less transparent and less accurate than it needs to be because an air monitoring station outside The Christie's main entrance was removed, therefore all local air quality measurements then ceased. The local boundary of the Air Quality Management Area was moved up along Wilmslow Road in 2016 to a location now close to Withington Village.
- No measurements are used that derive from the site of the proposed building. In the scale of things, the costs associated with the measurement of actual values of air quality at the site would have been trivial.
- It is clear that this proposed building would have many adverse local impacts. The Council conducted a formal consultation which produced around 500 objections. Whilst the Planning and Highway Committee will treat the outputs from this consultation as a material consideration, a building of this scale, complexity and importance seems completely unsuited to this form of planning process.

**Councillor Richard Kilpatrick** – The councillor has made the following comments:

- The residents of Didsbury are very proud of the Christie Hospital and the incredible work that it does day in day out in delivering and innovation of cancer treatment. There is no doubt that the Christie has a world renowned



reputation that is rightfully deserved. Nor do the residents believe that the Paterson should not be replaced after the devastating fire damage.

- The building proposed in the planning framework and subsequent planning application has caused major concern among local residents. Until now, the hospital has carefully managed how it impacts on the nearby residents who live alongside the “Christie Campus”. Residents on Wilmslow Road, Oak Road and off roads have had to live with the loss of amenity over the years as car parking, increase traffic and development impact the area. After careful consideration it is my view that the final application is not suitable and I remain to be persuaded that alternative solutions to the building replacement were exhausted before proceeding with this application.
- The height of the building will be unprecedented in South Manchester. It will be the biggest building between the Mersey and the City Centre. This height sets a dangerous precedent and changes the very character of the area. The reason for the height is that co-location of services within the building is vital for delivery of research, care and service. Co-location is important but options were explored to co-locate on site but not within the one building. This would have reduced the height of this building.
- The added pressure on car parking from the site and the added capacity is an issue that is yet to be addressed. There is concern that added capacity and added workforce will require further parking capacity at the Christie. To date I am yet to see a substantiated strategy to answer the increase in parking demand at the Christie site. S106 money used for the extension of the Christie Parking Zone should not be used as a reason to mediate this pressure, if anything it would add to the existing parking pressures and related to a separate application. If the committee is minded to approve this application conditions should be made for further car parking expansions and investment in sustainable travel to work. Furthermore, due to the loss of the cycle lane that will be required to access the site mitigation should be sought.
- The added traffic to the area causes parking and air pollution pressure. In line with the principle of the Climate Change Emergency Motion passed by the Council a suitable condition on this application would be to install a static air pollution monitor on the site which would provide valuable data in the ongoing air pollution debate and meet local ward plan aims and objectives. Furthermore, due to the loss of trees on the site the applicant should be requested to replace the three trees with nine trees to be planted elsewhere on the Christie site or in the community.
- In summary, residents in the surrounding area of the Christie are concerned about the height and thus loss of daylight, character of Wilmslow Road and overbearing nature of the design. It is requested that the committee take these views seriously when making their decision and if minded to approve that they request the conditions detailed in this response

**Rethink Paterson Residents’ Group** – Further correspondence has been received from Rethink Paterson’s legal representative, the comments are as follows:

- The proposal, due to its height, is not consistent with the character of the area and will have an adverse impact on the amount of daylight enjoyed by neighbouring residents.

- The conflicts with the Key Design Principles of the Christie Strategic Planning Framework. The committee report fails to explain what the impact of this conflict will be on any future development at The Christie by way of setting a precedent for much higher structures.
- There is no way that a 10 storey building in Withington can be said to “relate more to the local, rather than the City Centre urban context” as required by Policy EN2. The conclusion that the application satisfies Policy EN2 is therefore clearly wrong.
- There is no explanation of the heritage significance of Withington Conservation Area. The committee has no point of reference from which to assess the harm of the proposal to the various conservation areas.
- There is no adequate consideration of whether the “team science” concept could not be achieved equally well by developing the whole of the site and not just 75% of it.
- The application has been rushed through the system.
- Most of the 400+ expressions of support were on pre-printed postcards that contrasts starkly with the 500+ detailed and considered local objections.
- The committee report appears to be intended to misdirect the committee. The application should either be refused as fundamentally contrary to adopted policy or deferred to allow for proper scrutiny and a correct report.
- The obvious conflicts with relevant policy would normally mean that a proposal of this scale and in this location would be refused. Once this scheme is approved and built out, the impact on the future development of The Christie, on the character of Withington itself and the immediate neighbours will be irreversible.

## **2. Director of Planning - Further observations/comments**

**Air Quality** – Concerns have been raised about the submitted assessment and the fact that the application site is not within an Air Quality Management Area, the nearest of which are on Palatine Road and Wilmslow Road (Withington Village). Notwithstanding this, the applicant undertook air quality studies utilising desktop studies and data obtained from a number of receptor points, two of which are on Oak Road and Wilmslow Road, in close proximity to the application site. Given this work and the submitted findings, which have been outlined in the committee report, it is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon air quality.

**Setting a Precedent** – The height of the proposed building is derived from the specific requirements of the research facility, i.e. the amount of floorspace required and its location in relation to patients. As all planning application have to be dealt with on their own merits approval of this development would not give The Christie the greenlight to develop similar schemes throughout their campus.

**Policy EN2 (Tall Buildings)** – The main body of the report details why it is considered that the proposal complies with this policy.

**Impact upon Withington Conservation Area** – Withington Conservation Area was designated in 1983. The conservation area boundary defines a broadly linear area including Wilmslow Road, Parsonage Road, Burton Road, and Palatine Road which

extend from a central road junction. The area contains a diverse mix of buildings of different ages, architectural styles, materials and uses.

The village centre of Withington is to the centre of the conservation area and is largely characterised by the retail and commercial frontages to Wilmslow Road, which contain evidence of phased growth. The area also contains a mix of semi-detached and detached dwellings on secondary streets. The conservation area contains a variety of traditional building materials including red and buff brick, as well as stone, render, facades with a paint finish and modern additions. This variety and lack of uniformity adds to the character and appearance of the area. Roofs are generally slated and windows are primarily sliding-sashes, however a large number of modern window units are evident.

The central part of the conservation area has a larger concentration of two storey buildings of varying styles and ages, including 20<sup>th</sup> century additions lining the eastern side of Wilmslow Road, some of which are of lower quality and suffering from lack of maintenance. Many of the buildings in the retail core have been altered with the addition of large scale modern fascia signage.

The character of the southern part of the conservation area, i.e. the element closest to The Christie campus, also deviates from the commercial centre. This area has a stronger residential character where semi-detached and terraced dwellings are interspersed with churches, civic buildings and buildings in commercial use. This area is also more spacious and green, with a number of buildings set back from the road and occupying more generous plots containing mature trees.

The nearest part of the Withington Conservation Area to the site is Tatton Grove. The existing Paterson Building is visible from Tatton Grove, though views are filtered by trees. The proposal would be taller than the existing buildings, however, views of it would also be filtered by the existing tree coverage.

The proposed building would not be visible from the majority of the Withington Conservation Area including the commercial core, which contains a number of the notable, or the secondary residential streets to the east and west. It will however be clearly visible from Wilmslow Road and prominent in views southwards. In these views the proposal would appear as a backdrop, in combination with the existing buildings of The Christie. Although highly visible and taller than the prevailing buildings, the development would not impede or obscure any important views into or out of the Withington Conservation Area or harm the ability to appreciate the built form, architectural interest and key buildings of this conservation area. It will not affect the ability to appreciate the mixed commercial and residential character of the area or undermine the historic interest of the Withington Conservation Area.

**Team Science** – The Team Science approach that The Christie is proposing to employ in the proposed building has been explored in the main committee report.

**Representations received from Local Residents and Members of the Public** – None of the 484 letters of support were received in postcard form. For clarification, 343 letters of objection have been received.

**Policy compliance** – It has been demonstrated in the committee report that the proposal complies with the both national and local policies.

In light of the above, the recommendation remains one of **Minded to Approve** (subject to the expiration of the notification period in respect of the Further Environmental Information submitted by the applicant and no new issues being raised)

A number of additional conditions are suggested, namely:

- Provision of highway improvement works.
- That the proposed building is not occupied until the multi-storey car park is completed and available for use.
- Submission of details of the proposed cycle store and compound.
- That the proposed boilers would have nitrogen oxide emission levels of less than 40 mgNOX/kWh.

**APPENDIX TO AGENDA  
(LATE REPRESENTATIONS)**

**Planning and Highways Committee** 22 August 2019

**Item No.** 11

**Application Number** 123880/FO/2019

**Ward** Didsbury East  
Ward

**Description and Address**

Erection of two, three storey detached dwelling houses (six bedrooms) with associated landscaping and car parking following demolition

21 Didsbury Park, Manchester, M20 5LH

---

**1. Director of Planning - Further observations/comments**

Hedge/Landscaping

Further to the printed report to committee, the applicant has confirmed that the front privet hedge identified as H8 on the attached plan will have to be removed during the works and will be replaced with a new hedge and subject to condition number 4 which requires details of the hard and soft landscaping treatment. The hedge is listed as category C within the aboricultural impact assessment which is considered to be of very limited merit.

Conditions

If committee are minded to approve the application amendments are required to the following conditions:

Condition 2:

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

AL(05)020-P1 Proposed Location Plan

AL(05)021-P1 Proposed Site Plan

AL(05)022-P1 Proposed Elevations Key

AL(05)029-P1 Proposed Basement Floor Plan

AL(05)030-P1 Proposed Ground Floor Plan

AL(05)031-P1 Proposed First Floor Plan stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority, on the 18.06.2019

AL(05)032-P1 Proposed Second Floor Plan stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority, on the 18.06.2019

AL(05)036-P1 Proposed Side Elevations

AL(05)037-P1 Proposed Side Elevations

AL(05)040-P1 Proposed NE Elevation  
AL(05)041-P1 Proposed SW Elevation  
AL(05)050-P1 Proposed Landscaping Plan  
AL(05)051-P1 Proposed Front Boundary Treatment  
AL(05)052-P1 Proposed Roof Plan with Existing  
AL(05)053-P1 Comparative Dists Between Houses  
AL(05)054-P1 Proposed G and Exiting Overlay

SK079 Revision B NEW Proposed Roof Plan stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority, on the 05.08.2019

SK074 Proposed Front and Rear Elevations stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority, on the 05.08.2019

Ecological Assessment September 2019 prepared by Urban Green

Arboricultural Impact Assessment Project No 11551 prepared by Urban Green

Phase 1 Geo0Environmental Site Assessment REC reference  
-1C0106517P1R2 November 2018 prepared by REC

21 Didsbury Park Heritage Statement October 2018 prepared by Ruth Jackson Planning LTD

Planning Statement May 2019 prepared by ICENI Projects Limited

All drawings and documents stamped as received by the City Council as Local Planning Authority, on the 11.06.2019 unless otherwise stated.

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.

### Condition 3:

Notwithstanding the approved drawings the above ground construction works shall not commence until samples and specifications of all materials to be used in external elevations of the building (including a replacement treatment to the areas shown on the submitted drawings as dark grey stained timber) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with those 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.

The recommendation remains to **APPROVE** the application.

