



**Lambert
Smith
Hampton**

www.lsh.co.uk

Urban Design

Rebuttal Proof of Evidence

Land at Deansgate, Manchester

Planning application ref: 29406/FO/2021

Appeal ref: A

On behalf of

Fusion Manchester Devco Ltd

Prepared by

Colin Pullan BA(Hons) DipUD

Urban Design Director

Lambert Smith Hampton

UK House

180 Oxford Street

London

W1D 1NN

Tel: 0207 198 2000

Date: 11th March 2022

CONTENTS

1. Urban Design Rebuttal Proof of Evidence	4
1. Context.....	5
2. The Appeal Scheme	8
3. The Public Realm	9
4. The Alleged Harm to Townscape	9
Tall Buildings: Historic England Advice Note 4: March 2022	9
PMs Views	10
PM Views 1a, b and c, 2 and 3 (PM Figures 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29).....	10
PM View 4	11
PM View 5	12
PM View 6	12
PM View 7	13
PM View 8	13
PM View 9a	14
PM View 9b	15
PM View 10	15
PM Views 11A and B	16
PM Views Figure 42, 43 and 45	16
5. The Design of the Building, Overcrowding, Scale and Massing	17
The design of the building	17
Overcrowding	17
Scale and Massing	18

1. Urban Design Rebuttal Proof of Evidence

1.1. My rebuttal statement is confined to urban design and townscape related matters. I confirm that, insofar as the facts stated in my statement are within my own knowledge, I have made clear what they are, and I believe them to be true; and that the opinions I have expressed represent my true and complete professional opinion irrespective of by whom I am instructed.

1.2. This Rebuttal Proof of Evidence has been prepared to respond in advance to a number of points raised within the design evidence of the Council (proof of evidence of Mr. Paul Mason) (**PM**). The points addressed in this rebuttal are set out under the general headings below:

1. Context.
2. The Appeal Scheme.
3. The public realm.
4. The alleged harm to townscape.
5. The design of the building, overcrowding, scale and massing.

1.3. At point 4, this rebuttal evidence considers the townscape appraisal of PM. PM in his proof of evidence assesses a significant number of townscape views that were not requested by the Council and applies to his assessment the language of a Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment, citing magnitude and effect. However, PM has not demonstrated in evidence that he has undertaken any of the necessary steps of a TVIA such as summarised within the ES Volume 9.3 (CD A75) paragraph 1.7:

“Preparation of this assessment involves the following key stages:

- *Baseline survey;*
- *Identification of sensitive townscape and visual receptors;*
- *Description and quantification of the changes to the baseline;*
- *Identification of potential effects;*
- *Evaluation of the predicted effects; and*
- *Identification of mitigation measures”*

1.4. PM’s reference views are not appropriately located or recorded; for many of PMs identified views the assessments are made without indication of the Appeal Scheme to appropriately determine effect upon the ‘baseline’ – which includes, for many of the views tall buildings

within a diverse townscape. PM, with the GLVIA in mind, also does not identify the susceptibility of viewers to the effects or their sensitivity.

- 1.5. PM's assessment of harm using such terms as '*major adverse*' I therefore consider to be inappropriate.

1. Context

- 1.6. **At paragraph 3.54** of his evidence PM refers to the Manchester Residential Quality Guidance (CD-G3) and reproduces and extract from page 33 that refers to matters of height, scale and context. In full, the guidance at page 33 states (the additional text underlined):

"There is a need to demonstrate how proposed height and mass would fit within its context, appreciating the need to create a legible urban environment, provide a strong sense of enclosure and, where appropriate in schemes of sufficient scale, introduce landmarks.

In certain locations, this will involve maintaining the consistency of the existing urban form; in other cases the correct approach may be to introduce a shift in scale that can provide dramatic juxtaposition."

- 1.7. The DAS (CD A5) at Sections 5.4, 5.5, 5.6 and 5.7 demonstrates through massing studies and an appraisal of scale, how the proposed mass and height of the Appeal Scheme have been informed by, and will fit into, the context.
- 1.8. In the context of the Appeal Site as described at my proof of evidence Section 2, there is no consistency in urban form. Buildings are of contrasting height, scale and materials.
- 1.9. With reference to the appropriateness for a '*shift in scale*' as referred to by paragraph 33 of the Manchester Residential Quality Guidance (CD-G3) above, the Great Jackson Street Development Framework May 2018 Update (2018 SRF) (CD G7) provides supportive guidance on height and massing within the SRF area. The 2018 SRF highlights locations where taller buildings can be used as a signal to the regeneration of the site and emphasis its gateway function, i.e. supporting a shift in scale and a juxtaposition from the surrounding heights.
- 1.10. At paragraphs 3.11 to 3.14 the 2018 SRF (CD G7) states:

"The 2015 Framework includes a detailed tall building study. This identifies locations for tall buildings based on key views within the City Centre from Deansgate, St Peter's Square/Mosley

Street, the Mancunian Way and Chester Road approaches. This analysis was used to locate specific sites that could accommodate tall buildings to act as a landmarks and emphasise the site's gateway function and location. This analysis has been re-visited, and in line with the analysis, the scale of the buildings at the identified strategic locations has been reviewed.

Please cross refer to Appendix 1: Height at Strategic Points.

Sites were identified around the perimeter of the Framework area addressing the key views. Building heights then step down within the centre of the Framework area and towards Bridgewater House.

This has been the starting point of the massing analysis undertaken as part of this update. The sites identified for height and scale remain the same as identified in the 2015 Framework and are reinforced. A number of options have been tested as a result of which the creation of landmark buildings in key locations and an overall update to the composition of buildings in the Framework area is proposed to provide buildings with a strong visual profile, which will act as a marker at a key route into the City."

- 1.11. At pages 12 and 35 of the 2018 SRF (CD G7) (Reinforcing Previously Identified Opportunities for Height and; Height at Strategic Viewpoint: Strategic Viewpoint Locations - inset view 10 - reproduced within my proof of evidence at paragraphs 5.35 and 5.36) the Appeal Site is identified as having opportunity for a taller building of height. The tall buildings identified along Chester Road are significantly taller than within the wider context (Deansgate Tower West, Elizabeth House and at the Appeal Site) and there would remain a step down in height to the Bridgewater Canal Offices.
- 1.12. **At paragraphs 4.1 and 6.54** of his evidence PM states that Deansgate Quay is a seven storey residential building. This is not correct. The building is seven storeys above a lower ground car park (CP paragraph 4.16 and Figure 18).
- 1.13. **At Paragraph 4.2** of his evidence PM states: "*The site immediately to the west and north on the opposite side of Bridgewater Viaduct is under construction with two residential buildings, known as Castle Wharf...*" These buildings (2-4 Chester Road) are now complete as described in my proof of evidence at paragraph 4.12.

- 1.14. **At paragraph 4.23** of his evidence PM states that: *“In townscape terms the site can be seen to have a distinct association with the low rise buildings and viaduct immediately beyond, forming part of the land in both plan form and the views towards it from the west.”* And at **Paragraph 4.24** PM asserts: *“The grouping of built forms of the viaduct and railway infrastructure, both physically through attachment and in views where they are visually connected, relates this built form with the Castlefield Conservation Area. In townscape terms this presents a connected and integrated historic urban fabric that appears as an evolved, intricate and weaving of layers of historic townscape that contributes to the special uniqueness and character of the area of high townscape value.”*
- 1.15. As described in my proof of evidence at Section 2, the context is of a variety of building heights and as such, I do not consider that there is anything ‘distinctive’ about the association of the Appeal Site with low rise buildings or the Conservation Area. The association of the Appeal Site to low-rise buildings and the Conservation Area is a relationship shared with many of the recent tall building developments within the area, such as 2-4 Chester Road and Deansgate Square. Evident from a site visit the townscape is defined by both modern and historic buildings. Considering the visual connection between the Appeal Site and the Conservation Area, it is also of note that 2-4 Chester Road forms a ‘visual barrier’ between the Appeal Site and the Conservation Area, as described at my proof of evidence, paragraph 3.13 and Figure 14.
- 1.16. **At paragraph 4.36** of his evidence PM states: *“Where modern materials are used in taller buildings to the Great Jackson Street Development Framework Area such as Deansgate Square they are in high quality unitised panelled glazed clad facades with metal perforated screens, to provide high reflectivity and a distinct contrast between the traditional built form and clearly modern tall buildings. Metalwork is anodised to give a high quality finish and depth / reflective quality to the materials. These materials have a unifying affect in identifying the regeneration area to the south as distinct from the traditional materials used elsewhere.”*
- 1.17. There is evident a variety of modern materials in the SRF area. The River Street Tower has a weathered steel cladding (my proof of evidence Figure 23, page 27); and the recently approved 34 Great Jackson Street scheme comprises towers with a frame of red brick which is a material contrast with the otherwise glazed facades at Deansgate Square (my proof of evidence paragraph 4.22).

2. The Appeal Scheme

- 1.18. **At paragraph 6.16** of his proof of evidence PM states that the materials used in the Appeal Site are industrial looking, solid, with standard pattern of fenestration applied in a uniform way. This is not correct. There is variation in fenestration to the elevation at the ground floor and the corners (my proof of evidence Figures 39, 40 and 46). The consistency of pattern of glazing to the middle part of the elevations is similar to that of the other tall buildings in the SRF area, such as at Deansgate Square and the River Street Tower.
- 1.19. **At paragraph 6.16** of his proof of evidence PM states: *“This solid visual nature created by a weathered steel cladding material has the effect of increasing the dominance of the building rather than reducing it.”*
- 1.20. The 2018 SRF (CD G7) supports diversity in materials form a common palette and for each plot identified for a tall building to stand out. With reference to paragraphs 3.87 and 3.88:
- “3.87 In order to create a new neighbourhood the palette of materials should be complementary whilst providing the required diversity to create a unique sense of place and for each plot to stand out in their own right.*
- 3.88 The proposed tall buildings on the perimeter of the site are visible throughout the City Centre and also on the approach to the City...Therefore the materiality approach is likely to be different from that of those buildings located within the rest of the Framework area and importantly, materiality should be appropriate for the form of the buildings. The application of materials is also important in the sense that they should also be simply detailed, limited in palette, robust, high-quality and easily maintained.”*
- 1.21. The Appeal Site is at a location at the edge of the SRF area where a tall building of a different material to glazing would be consistent with the guidance. The weathered steel cladding is a contrast to the glazing of Deansgate West Tower and the white cladding of 2-4 Chester Road. It is a material appropriate to the SRF palette, addresses the opportunity for variation and is complementary to the more traditional red brick material in the surrounding context as I set out in my proof of evidence at Section 3 and summarise at paragraph 3.28.
- 1.22. That the Appeal Scheme may be tall and of a more ‘solid’ elevation as a result of the weathered steel cladding I do not consider harmful to context. Nos. 2-4 Chester Road is of a

design and material which contribute to its solidity. Deansgate Tower West, though glazed, is of a significantly greater height and scale and is particularly dominant in the townscape and though glazed, it is visually 'solid' being of a large, plain and monolithic scale.

3. The Public Realm

- 1.23. **At paragraphs 6.39 and 6.51** of his proof of evidence, PM asserts that the Appeal Scheme will provide little public realm. The 2017 permission scheme did not provide a positive contribution to the public realm as my evidence explains at paragraphs 3.25, 3.26 and 3.27. As I set out at my proof of evidence paragraph 6.18 the SRF did not require the Appeal Site to deliver open space. The 2018 SRF (CD G7) simply illustrated the plan for the 2017 permission scheme and updated the previous 2015 SRF which illustrated no open space at the Appeal Site (Figure 36 of my proof of evidence). The appropriateness of the public realm provision is set out at my proof of evidence, paragraphs 6.18 and 6.19.

4. The Alleged Harm to Townscape

Tall Buildings: Historic England Advice Note 4: March 2022

- 1.24. The recently published Tall Buildings: Historic England Advice Note 4 provides guidance on the consideration of the effects of change arising from tall buildings upon the townscape. Of relevance to context and the 2018 SRF (CD G7) as described above:

"2.4 The development of tall buildings can have positive impacts upon an area, particularly if they are part of a wider regeneration scheme.

4.4 Tall building policies can be informed by a design framework (including policies, Supplementary Planning Documents, and codes) which responds to evidence gathered for the development plan. Design frameworks should consider: Important features such as views, skylines, streetscape, building scale and materials, landmark buildings, and heritage assets; „ Opportunities where prominent or tall buildings may be appropriate and enhance overall townscape legibility...

4.5 (1) Where tall buildings are proposed in regeneration areas, there may be opportunities to improve local character through design...

4.10 A sifting process informed by mapping analysis and evidence... can be used to identify areas and sites for tall buildings. This approach takes account of factors such as character,

townscape and landscape value and significance of heritage assets. The process can be used to identify locations where risk of impact on the historic environment from tall buildings proposals is either avoided or minimised.”

1.25. The above guidance has been met by the 2018 SRF (CD G7) visual appraisal as noted earlier, and the objectives of the 2018 SRF in respect of a tall building on the Appeal Site are, I consider, demonstrably met by the Appeal Scheme.

1.26. The guidance considers also the merits of clustering tall buildings:

“4.16 Establishing a consolidated form of tall buildings as a cluster can bring some benefits if it is well-defined, well-designed, integrated, and managed”

1.27. The Appeal Scheme would be perceived as part of the cluster that includes Deansgate Square and 2-4 Chester Road and as described within the DAS and at paragraph 6.15 of my proof of evidence, designed with regard to this cluster and its townscape.

PMs Views

1.28. **At paragraph 6.17** of his proof of evidence PM introduces 17 viewpoints (shown at his Figure 23) to inform his townscape assessment.

1.29. The Environmental Statement (ES) Appendix 9.5 (CD A77) undertakes a visual assessment and Appendix 9.6 (CD A78) provides supporting visualisations of the Appeal Scheme in its context. The ES Appendix 9.5 (CD A77) viewpoints are representative of both static and kinetic views (i.e. pedestrians, motorists and cyclists) and it is understood that no further views were required of the Appeal Scheme by the Council. PM’s key views 1 to 6 are generally addressed in the assessment of Viewpoints 1 and 7 of ES Appendix 5 (CD A77). PM’s key views 7, 8, 11a, 11b are generally addressed in the assessment of Viewpoints 1 and 9 of ES Appendix 5 (CD A77). PM’s key views 9a, 9b and 10 are not assessed in the ES Appendix 9.5 (CD A77).

1.30. I comment on PM’s key views below.

PM Views 1a, b and c, 2 and 3 (PM Figures 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29)

1.31. These five views at Figures 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29 of PM’s proof of evidence are representative of approaching the Appeal Site from the east along Chester Road.

- 1.32. For these views, the foreground elements in the townscape, the lower older buildings, are well defined and the railway viaducts provide a visual break between foreground and background. The background modern buildings comprise the tall glazed towers at Deansgate Square and the large white stone clad 2-4 Chester Road. The modern buildings are a noticeable contrast in material with the foreground and they are the dominant structures (by height, scale and material).
- 1.33. In my opinion the Appeal Scheme would not erode the ability to understand and appreciate the historic scale and form of the existing townscape in the foreground which would remain visible in their entirety for these views. The railway viaducts would continue to provide a visual break between foreground and background. The Appeal Scheme in the background would not be the dominant structure of the skyline. It would not be the highest structure, nor of the greatest scale.
- 1.34. That the materials of the Appeal Scheme are sympathetic to the foreground buildings, I consider a positive relationship and appropriate to the juxtaposition/marker qualities that the SRF seeks of tall buildings at the edge of the SRF area as I set out earlier at paragraph 1.20. The Appeal Scheme would be a new marker that would encourage exploration and movement further into Deansgate South and into the SRF area.

PM View 4

- 1.35. View 4, Figure 30 of PM's proof of evidence, is a constrained view looking west towards the Congregational Chapel tower which is seen above the railway viaduct. View 4 is similar to Viewpoint 7 of the ES Appendix 5 (CD A77). In the wider setting to this view and prominent in the townscape is Atlas Tower, the towers at Deansgate Square and 2-4 Chester Road. Both PM and ES Appendix 5 (CD A77) consider that the visual effects of the Appeal Scheme upon the view to the chapel tower would be 'Major Adverse' (PM **paragraphs 6.28 and 6.29**). However, ES Appendix 5 (CD A77) considered that the harmful effects arise not from the material, but the combined effects of tall buildings:

"The proposed materiality is in keeping of the contextual prevalence of red brick. However, the increase prominence of tall buildings will compete with the Grade II Former Congregational Chapel and railway viaduct detracting from these heritage assets; modern architecture would ultimately prevail over the historic context."

- 1.36. Any tall building on the Appeal Site would have a similar cumulative effect upon this view and for the reasons I set out at paragraphs 1.32, 1.33 and 1.34 above, I do not consider the materiality of the Appeal Scheme to be harmful.

PM View 5

- 1.37. View 5, Figure 31 of PM's proof of evidence, is a distorted google earth view (there is converging of the tall buildings which reduces the visible sky) looking west from the Bridgewater Viaduct / Chester Road. **At paragraph 6.30** PM notes the townscape qualities of Deansgate Quay, referencing the quality brick of the apartments and their low scale. **At Paragraph 6.31** PM asserts that the Appeal Scheme will have a "*major adverse*" visual effect upon the townscape in this view for reasons including the contrast of height, scale and materials.
- 1.38. I disagree with PM's assertions for the reasons set out at paragraphs 7.7 and 7.8 of my proof of evidence. The weathered steel cladding of the Appeal Scheme would contribute to the modern and distinctive architecture of the SRF area. The use of weather steel cladding is a divergence from the glazed towers in Deansgate Square at the centre of the SRF area and is appropriate to Appeal Site's edge of SRF area context. The weathered cladding would complement the red/terracotta brick of the historic buildings and Deansgate Quay.
- 1.39. It is evident from Figure 31 of PM's proof of evidence that Deansgate Quay would remain subservient in the townscape to the modern towers and that Deansgate Tower West would remain the dominant townscape feature.

PM View 6

- 1.40. View 6, Figure 32 of PM's proof of evidence, is a Google Earth view looking west along Chester Road. A similar view is provided at Figure 45 of my proof of evidence, and a view with the Appeal Scheme is provided at my Figure 46.
- 1.41. **At Paragraph 6.32** of PM's proof of evidence the effects of the Appeal Scheme are considered major – adverse, and reference is also made to matters of overbearing and enclosure and the canyoning of Deansgate Quay.
- 1.42. I disagree with this assessment. My proof of evidence at paragraphs 7.7 and 7.8 describe the visual effects of the Appeal Scheme for the view west along Chester Road. The addition of the Appeal Scheme would form part of the existing townscape of modern tall buildings, and

reflect the guidance of the SRF to locate a distinctive/marker tall building at the Appeal Site. The Appeal Scheme would be sited beyond Deansgate Quay and would define the end of the junction of Deansgate and Chester Road. There would be a change in the skyline – as accepted by the 2017 Permission Scheme – however, there would remain views of the sky along Chester Road as illustrated by the CGI at Figure 46 of my proof of evidence. I do not consider that the addition of the Appeal Scheme would be harmful to the townscape. Rather, it would reinforce and enhance the townscape.

PM View 7

- 1.43. View 7, Figure 33 of PM’s proof of evidence, is a view east along Chester Road from the Bridgewater Canal Offices. It is similar to Viewpoint 9 of ES Appendix 9.5 (CD A77). For this view the ES concluded visual effects of moderate beneficial. The notes to the assessment of Viewpoint 9 state:

“The technical visualisation in Appendix 9.6 shows that the Proposed Development will be visible at the centre of the view, a prominent location. However the scale of change is relatively limited, as it replaces a view to the Axis Tower, and the proposed volume is appropriate to the contextual tall buildings. The proposed building would aid the visual grounding of Elizabeth Tower with the surrounding lower built-form.”

- 1.44. PM states **at paragraph 6.34** of his proof of evidence that the visual effects of the Appeal Scheme upon View 7 would be “*major adverse*”, principally owing to the proposed materials, height and scale.
- 1.45. My proof of evidence considers the view east along Chester Road at paragraph 7.4. I consider that the materials are contextually appropriate and in accordance with the 2018 SRF (CD G7) as I set out above at paragraph 1.20. And for the reasons at paragraphs 7.4 and 7.5 of my proof of evidence, I also consider that the Appeal Scheme would not be overbearing upon the streetscene.

PM View 8

- 1.46. View 8, Figure 34 of PM’s proof of evidence, is taken from Deansgate looking east towards the Appeal Site. PM asserts **at paragraph 6.37** that the Appeal Scheme would have a “*major adverse*” effect for reasons of canyoning, the visible contrast in materials with the glazing of Deansgate Square and Beetham Tower and that the mass of the Appeal Scheme would dominant the view.

1.47. The ES Appendix 9.5 (CD A77) assesses a similar view as Viewpoint 1 and notes:

“The choice of corten-steel as prevailing cladding material contributes to a modern and distinctive architecture, it diversifies from the Deansgate Square to the right, but complements the red brick of the existing and historic features. The detailing of the corner provides a unique gateway feature and contributes to the definition of a positive streetscape. Ultimately, the proposal replaces an non-descript car park that currently diminishes the quality of the view.”

1.48. The ES Appendix 9.5 (CD A77) for Viewpoint 1 concludes a major beneficial effect (my emphasis). I note that the ES refers to corten-steel which is a brand name for weather steel and that the Appeal Scheme proposes weathered steel.

1.49. I concur with the conclusion of the ES Appendix 9.5 (CD A77) and disagree with the conclusion of PM for reasons as I set out at paragraphs 7.3 and 7.4 of my proof of evidence with reference to distant views and at paragraph 6.10 with reference to closer views and Figure 40 (Viewpoint 1 of ES Appendix 9.5) (CD A77).

1.50. I do not consider that the Appeal Scheme will introduce harmful canyoning effects to the townscape. Figures 40 and 44 of my proof of evidence do not illustrate ‘canyoning’ as there is evident distance and sky between the tall buildings.

1.51. Figures 40 and 44 of my proof of evidence demonstrate that the proposed weathered steel cladding is of a complementary tone to the red brick older buildings, and as also noted earlier in this rebuttal at paragraph 1.20, the 2018 SRF guidance (CD G7) would accept a contrast in materiality to the glazed towers of Deansgate Square at the Appeal Site. I would add that the 2017 Permission Scheme is also of a different material to Deansgate Square (as described within my proof of evidence at paragraph 3.27). Figures 40 and 44 also demonstrate that whilst the Appeal Scheme would define the corner of the Appeal Site, Beetham House and Deansgate Tower West remain dominant.

PM View 9a

1.52. View 9a, Figure 36 of PM’s proof of evidence, is from Deansgate South looking west. The view is a Google Earth image with evident distortion of the buildings. **At paragraph 6.39** PM asserts a “major adverse” detrimental effect due to the contrast of material and height.

- 1.53. At Figure 47 my proof of evidence includes a similar view to View 9a, without the distortion, and at Figure 48 of my proof of evidence there is a CGI view of the Appeal Scheme. I disagree with PM's assertion for the reasons as set out at paragraphs 7.10 and 7.11 of my proof of evidence and with reference to Figure 48 of my proof of evidence. I consider that the Appeal Scheme would be a positive addition to the townscape. Evident in my proof of evidence at Figure 48 is the complementary tone of material between the Appeal Scheme and Deansgate Quay that helps integrate the taller building into the context. Evident from walking Deansgate South, the towers at Deansgate Square will remain the dominant feature of the townscape in this visual context.

PM View 9b

- 1.54. PM's proof of evidence at Figure 37 provides a view from Deansgate South looking across the Appeal Site north towards 2-4 Chester Road. **At paragraph 6.39** PM asserts the same harm as applied to 9a. I disagree with PM's conclusions for the reasons as I set out above at paragraph 1.53.

- 1.55. A similar townscape view to View 9b with the Appeal Scheme in place is provided at Figure 39 of my proof of evidence. Figure 39 illustrates the proposed street trees, the activity at the ground floor that visually contributes to the public realm. Up close, one would be able to appreciate the quality of the materials and detailing. I consider this to be a significant improvement to the existing view.

PM View 10

- 1.56. Figures 38, 39 of PM's proof of evidence, which collectively represent View 10, are taken from the Castlefield Basin north of the Appeal Site. PM asserts that the Appeal Scheme will have a "*major-adverse*" effect due to the solidity of the building.
- 1.57. I disagree with this conclusion. It is evident in both Figures 38 and 38 that 2-4 Chester Road is a prominent and solid, contrasting white stone building that dominates the foreground basin and Chester Road viaduct. In the background, despite being glazed, the towers of Deansgate Square are predominant in the view, dwarfing the foreground Chapel in Figure 38, and Deansgate Quay in Figure 39.
- 1.58. In both Figures 38 and 39 of PM's proof of evidence there is evident contrast in scale, colour and height to the townscape. The Appeal Scheme would not detract from this townscape. Nor do I consider that the Appeal Scheme should contrast with the materiality of the Chapel to

enable it to visually recede. It is evident in Figures 38 and 39 that Deansgate Quay, which is of a similar material colour, is set in the background; and that in Figure 39 the road viaduct delineates between the foreground basin and the background buildings. This delineation maintains a distinction between the older areas and newer modern building for similar reasons as I set out above at paragraphs 1.32 to 1.34 with regard to views along Chester Road.

PM Views 11A and B

- 1.59. Figures 40 and 41 of PM's proof of evidence (which represent Views 11A and B) are Google Earth views looking east along Chester Road towards the Appeal Site. **At paragraph 6.44** of his proof of evidence PM, on assessing views 11A and B, acknowledges the importance of the traditional palette that anchors the low rise buildings.
- 1.60. Viewpoint 9 of the ES Appendix 9.5 (CD A77) is a similar view to 11A, but taken from a few metres east, revealing a 13 storey red clad building in the foreground and which would be seen as part of the same townscape experience. The ES considers the Appeal Scheme to have a Moderate Beneficial effect to the view. PM at paragraph 6.45 of his proof of evidence asserts a "*moderate-adverse*" harm. PM asserts that the Appeal Scheme will be a visually heavy material in comparison with the glazing and stone of other taller buildings, and that the Appeal Scheme would be prominent.
- 1.61. I address this view at paragraphs 8.4 and 8.5 of my evidence and I consider that the proposed tower is not unduly prominent or incongruous in a townscape which includes other red brick/ terracotta tall buildings and significantly taller buildings in other materials.

PM Views Figure 42, 43 and 45

- 1.62. **At paragraphs 6.46 and 6.47** of PM's proof of evidence there is an appraisal of wider views of the Appeal Scheme with reference to Figure 42, 43 and 44. Figure 42 is Viewpoint 8 of the ES Appendix 9.5 (CD 77); Figure 43 is Viewpoint 12; and Figure 44 is Viewpoint 3. PM asserts that for these Viewpoints, the Appeal Scheme due to materiality, scale and form would stand out and adversely impacts on the established and emerging skyline.
- 1.63. The ES considered that the visual effects for these views was as follows: Viewpoint 8 (Moderate beneficial); Viewpoint 12 (moderate major beneficial); and Viewpoint 3 (moderate neutral).

- 1.64. It is evident from these viewpoints that hue of the Appeal Scheme is familiar to the context. While the Appeal Scheme will be distinguishable, I do not consider this to be harmful, particularly given the guidance for tall buildings in the 2018 SRF (CD G7) as described earlier. It is evident that for these viewpoints, the scale and height of the towers at Deansgate Square and Elizabeth Tower would remain dominant in townscape.

5. The Design of the Building, Overcrowding, Scale and Massing

The design of the building

- 1.65. **At paragraph 6.53** of PM's proof of evidence PM states that the walls of the Appeal Scheme are 'sheer' and 'imposing'.
- 1.66. I disagree. I would describe the glazed towers at Deangate Square as being sheer and imposing, for there is little articulation other than the colouration of the glazing panels. By contrast, the walls of the Appeal Scheme are articulated by glazing and the weathered steel panels and further articulation in the panels as described at paragraph 6.10 of my proof of evidence.
- 1.67. **At paragraphs 6.59 to 6.61** of his proof of evidence PM discusses the Flatiron Building and compares its design and context with the Appeal Scheme.
- 1.68. The flatiron is an inspiration for the design and a wholly appropriate reference for the Appeal Scheme for the reasons as set out in the DAS. My proof of evidence addresses the comparison to the Flatiron Building at paragraph 6.7 to 6.10. In summary, the Appeal Scheme responds to a similar shaped site, at a prominent location, with an attractive and well-proportioned building.
- 1.69. **At paragraph 6.61** of his proof of evidence PM discusses the need for a purer form. There is no architectural requirement in the 2018 SRF (CD G7) for simple forms in towers, particularly for locations such as the Appeal Site as I discuss earlier.

Overcrowding

- 1.70. **At paragraph 6.55** of his proof of evidence PM criticises the siting of Appeal Scheme relative to Deansgate Quay. I have addressed general matters of overcrowding with regard to townscape earlier with reference to PM's views as appropriate. As I set out at paragraphs 9.4 and 9.5 of my proof evidence and within my context appraisal at paragraph 4.7, the

relationship of the Appeal Scheme to Deansgate Quay is consistent with the surrounding context of close set buildings and I find no harm with this relationship.

- 1.71. PM asserts no harm with regard to outlook, sunlight or daylight within his proof of evidence.

Scale and Massing

- 1.72. **At Paragraph 6.56** of his proof of evidence, PM makes a reference to canyoning with reference to his Figure 47, which is a view of the western elevation of the Appeal Scheme from Chester Road. The assertion is made that the Appeal Scheme would impose a large scale building out of place and incongruous to the low rise townscape.

- 1.73. As I set out earlier in this rebuttal, the 2018 SRF (CD G7) supports a tall building on the Appeal Site. Any tall building would be incongruous to a low rise townscape. The townscape however is not low rise, but mixed and in the context of the Appeal Site includes the significantly tall towers of Deansgate Square. Plainly, a tall building of a greater scale than the lower rise buildings would not be incongruous.

- 1.74. **At paragraph 6.59 of** PM's proof of evidence reference is made to the 2018 SRF (CD G7) the 2017 Permission Scheme, which PM considers is appropriate. As I explain earlier at paragraph 1.25 and also at my proof of evidence paragraph 6.34, the 2018 SRF has simply taken the 2017 Permission Scheme for the Appeal Site and added it to the plan. My opinion is that the 2018 SRF supports a tall building on the Appeal Site and that the Appeal Scheme is an appropriate design.