

Manchester Civic Society
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

3 August 2020

Dear Mr Morris,

127300/FO/2020

8 Birch Polygon Manchester M14 5HX

Erection of a single storey rear extension and conversion of property to provide 5 no. self contained apartments with associated elevational alterations, car parking and landscaping 8 Birch Polygon Manchester M14 5HX

Manchester Civic Society OBJECTS strongly to this proposal.

Manchester Civic Society is full agreement with the detailed objection letter submitted by the Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society. There is no need to repeat here the points made; we fully endorse them.

Manchester Civic Society notes that the previous application (124997/FO/2019) to develop this property has been withdrawn. That proposal was a gross overdevelopment of the site; this is a lesser one, but still very significant overdevelopment.

This proposal does not provide a larger family home; it removes one.

The attitude of the City Council to development is set out in its ***Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance***. We wish to highlight two relevant issues it raises.

The Council wishes to prevent further loss of family housing. Para 7.4 states:

Parts of the City have seen the loss of family housing in favour of flats to such an extent that the character and sustainability of these areas is jeopardised. We believe that the balance of development in such areas should now revert to the provision of a range of family housing more traditionally characteristic of these parts of the City, which can offer choice to local people and assist the sustainability of these neighbourhoods.

The Design and Access Statement seeks to justify the proposal to convert this large single home to apartments by employing 'context', i.e. the fact that some nearby properties have been subdivided (Section 2.0). This approach is no longer the City Council's preferred choice for development. Manchester's current and expressed need is to retain and enhance the large family homes, both to ensure a vibrant and mixed community of occupants and to retain the sustainability of neighbourhoods.

In the present uncertain circumstances, there is a distinct prospect of a surplus of apartments and small flats becoming available, due both to changes in student population and to an upsurge in working from home in the satellite metropolitan boroughs.

The Council values its attractive Victorian Era properties

11.6 The City's Victorian terraces exist in many areas and there are a wide variety of styles and sizes, from small back of pavement homes, **to elegant properties with large gardens**. They provide a safe, supportive environment and where they are well looked after, retain an attractive and welcoming sense of place.

11.7 These areas will continue to sustain medium to high densities. However **the introduction of a broader choice of housing is important and this may lead to the reduction of densities in particular circumstances**. Infill sites and conversions should respect and enhance the simple urban character of the area, whilst at the same time introducing choice, variety and interest, although pastiche, or poorly considered new developments or extensions will be discouraged. Garden wall, window and door details which are typical of the period, should be retained.

PARKING is still a vexed issue.

Much of the rear garden area is lost, despite the claim that the *appearance* of the hard standing is attenuated by the garden areas. The same is true at the front of the property.

There is no mention of the **loss of garden wall at the front**.

The narrow pathway to the rear garden parking poses access and safety problems.

IN CONCLUSION, Manchester Civic Society OBJECTS because

1. This is a very substantial and handsome semi-detached property which retains the ability to resume its original function as a large family home.
2. The incorporation of a small 3 bedroomed flat within its walls, generated as part of a subdivision of such a home, does not provide the large and rare family homes which are needed in a mixed community.
3. Large family homes in central Manchester and near to the University are sadly rare and thus in demand. It would be quite wrong, and against council policy, to lose this one to apartments.
4. Victorian family homes, including large homes in large gardens, are a valued component of Manchester's mix of housing.

Far from providing a valued larger family home this proposal actually removes one from the market.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

Manchester Civic Society

[Redacted Address]

Mr Dave Morris
Planning & Regeneration
Manchester City Council
M60 2LA

3 August 2020

Dear Mr Morris

Reference: 127300/FO/2020

Address: 8 Birch Polygon, Manchester M14 5HX

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension and conversion of property to provide 5 no. self contained apartments with associated elevational alterations, car parking and landscaping.

Re 127300/FO/2020

We are writing on behalf of the Committee of the Rusholme, Moss Side & Fallowfield Civic Society to make a representation **against** this application. _____

Please note that the Civic Society has an active committee and a membership of 161, and works, on behalf of the residents of Rusholme, Fallowfield, and part of Ardwick wards, on objectives that include:

- a) To encourage the preservation, development and improvement of the features which go to make pleasing conditions in which to live and work.
- b) To encourage high standards of architecture and town planning in the area.

We consider that the planning application is contrary to a number of Manchester City Council's adopted planning policies. On this basis, we request that the planning department determines/recommends **refusal of the application**.

Please find full details of our objection below.

With respect to the Council's Local Plan:

- 1. Core Strategy - Policy SP1 Spatial Principles.** This policy requires that *development in all parts of the City should:- Make a positive contribution to neighbourhoods of choice including:-*
- *creating well designed places that enhance or create character*
 - *making a positive contribution to the health, safety and wellbeing of residents*
 - *considering the needs of all members of the community regardless of age, gender, disability, sexuality, religion, culture, ethnicity or income*
 - *protect and enhance the built and natural environment.*

The proposed development erases the majority of landscaping and all existing trees from the plot; it will increase noise and air pollution and will be detrimental to the quality of life for the local residents.

The overlay of pedestrian and vehicular access still remains H&S risk. The natural environment has already suffered from the proposal. If implement the development will cause permanent damage to the character of the area.

As such, **this proposal is contrary to policy SP1.**

2. **Core Strategy – Policy H1 Overall Housing Provision.** This policy states that *Within the Inner Areas in North, East and Central Manchester densities will be lower but generally around 40 units per hectare. The type, size and tenure of the housing mix will be assessed on a site by site basis and be influenced by local housing need and economic viability.*
This proposal is in the Inner Area in Central Manchester, and proposes a density of 5 units in 0.0516 hectares. This is a density of c 94.4 units per hectare. This represents a significant over-development (more than twice) of the site. **This proposal is contrary to this element of policy H1.**
3. **Core Strategy – Policy H1 Overall Housing Provision (contd).** This policy also requires that: *Proposals for new residential development should take account of the need to: ...Reflect the spatial distribution set out... All proposals should make provision for appropriate usable amenity space.*
The proposed amenity space at the rear is still very poor for the number of proposed dwellers and the front garden is completely destroyed. **This proposal is contrary to this element of policy H1.**
4. **Core Strategy – H5 'Housing policy for Central Manchester' incl. Rusholme.** This policy states that *Priority will be given to family housing and other high value high quality development where this can be sustained...The emphasis will be on increasing the availability of family housing and diversifying housing stock in mono-tenure areas, preserving and improving the quality of the existing housing stock and the management of areas where HMOs predominate.*
This proposal will result in a loss of a valuable and attractive family home which some of the local families were hoping to buy to live in but could not succeed in competing with developers at the auction. **This proposal is contrary to policy H5.**
5. **Core Strategy – H11 'HMO'.** The proposal is located in the area with very high concentration of HMOs. The property has not been licensed as HMO previously. **This proposal is contrary to policy H11.**
6. **Core Strategy – Policies EN4 and EN8, Reducing CO2/ Carbon Emissions & Climate Change**
The applicant provides no evidence how the development will seek to reduce CO2 footprint/ emission. Whilst the developer might argue that rainwater harvesting and other active environmental features are not economically viable, the very nature of the development significantly reduces opportunities for passive energy efficient design. The layout provides most flat with single orientation, omitting opportunities for natural cross ventilation and simple passive design measures. This will result in overheating and poor air quality and a use of fans and chillers during summer period. A family home would not have the same issue as the internal spaces would be interconnected. The proposal does not take opportunity 'to provide linked and diverse green space to enhance natural habitats which will assist species adaptation'. Moreover, the owners have already destroyed the existing green area which was connecting all back gardens in the neighbourhood. The proposed hard surface will increase the amount of run-off water and put more pressure on the drainage system. **This proposal is contrary to policies EN4 and EN8**
7. **Core Strategy – Policy EN9 Green Infrastructure** As mentioned above, the proposal has already destroyed a link between the existing green spaces and significantly reduced a variety of local species. MCC encourages *green roofs, green walls, tree planting and other forms of*

green infrastructure to allow for the adaption to climate change in heavily urbanised areas.

The proposal includes nothing of the above. **This proposal is contrary to policy EN9**

8. **Core Strategy – Policy EN19 Waste.** The proposed management plan is based on three Eurobins and a smaller green bin (not shown on the diagrams as it wouldn't fit). The local area however is not served by large bins as evident from other apartment type developments. The proposal will result in 15 bins requirement. The area identified for bins is not shown in details but is insufficient. **This proposal does not meet requirements of Policy EN19 Waste.**
9. **Core Strategy - Policy DM1 Development Management.** This development does not have regard for a number of issues listed in DM1: *Impact on the surrounding area in terms of the scale of the proposed development. Effects on amenity, including privacy, light, noise, vibration, air quality, litter, birds, road safety and traffic generation. Adequacy of internal accommodation and external amenity space. Vehicular access and car parking. Effects relating to biodiversity, landscape. Green Infrastructure including open space, both public and private.* **This proposal is contrary to policy DM1.**

With respect to the Council's Saved UDP:

10. Citywide Development Control Policies – H2.5 'Converting Houses into Flats' and DC5 'Flats conversion'

*H2.5 Conversion of houses into flats and residential institutions such as nursing homes will only be allowed when it can be demonstrated that:- a) either off-street car parking can be provided without undue loss of amenity space around the house or it can be demonstrated that on-street parking is unlikely to create significant problems; b) the conversion will not detract from the character of the area by, for example, the removal of trees, hedges or garden walls which are important elements in the street scene. **Objective: To maintain and where necessary improve the quality of the housing stock and residential environments.***

Reason: To maintain the quality of the residential environment by limiting the loss of gardens, the increase in noise and parking problems which can be caused by the conversion of houses into flats.

FLAT CONVERSIONS DC5.1 In determining planning applications to convert property to flats, the Council will have regard to: a. the standard of accommodation for the intended occupiers of the premises; b. effects on adjoining houses as a result of noise from flats passing through party walls and affecting adjoining houses; c. adequacy of car parking, off-street car parking being normally required where practicable, and essential where there is so severe an existing on-street parking problem that unacceptable additional pressures would be created; d. general effects on the character of the neighbourhood, including the extent to which flat conversion schemes are a new or an established feature of the immediate area, avoiding the loss of front gardens and the retention of existing trees and shrubs; e. adequate private outdoor amenity space; f. the desirability of achieving easy access for all, including disabled people (as a minimum, access for disabled people will normally be required in conversions of ground floor accommodation); g. the satisfactory provision of refuse storage and collection facilities.

DC5.3 the Council will normally refuse permission for any developments in this category which: a. do not provide accommodation to the Council's current approved standards; b. are in tightly-packed residential streets where there is no scope for off-street car parking and where there is already an acknowledged problem of on-street congestion; c. involve conversion schemes without adequate private external amenity space; d. are schemes without satisfactory refuse storage and collection facilities.

This proposal is contrary to the above policies. It relies on utilising the back garden as a parking for 3 vehicles with insufficient amenity space for the number of occupants. The entire back garden area has already been cleared of all plants and greenery to be converted into a hard-paved parking area – all carried out without a permission or notification to the planning authorities. The owners have removed 12 mature trees and smaller shrubs and overgrowths which is a serious breach of planning procedures and in itself is a cause of our serious concerns. The noise and disruption from vehicles moving to the parking slots will have detrimental effect on the adjacent family homes and their quality of life due to noise and air pollution. There is no opportunity for on-street parking in the area especially considering the large numbers of spaces required. The waste strategy is still unresolved and the area proposed for the waste bins will not be sufficient for 15 bins requires to serve 5 individual apartments. The use of large Eurobins is impractical at Birch Polygon due to access issues. Other apartments are served with 3 individual bins each. **This proposal is contrary to Saved UDP H2.5 and DC5.1, DC5.3.**

11. Citywide Development Control Policies on ‘Residential Extensions’, the proposal is contrary to a number of DC 1 policies, namely:

- **DC1.1 b)** – significant negative effect upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers;
- **DC1.2 b)** – the proposed extension will result in loss of sunlight and daylight at the neighbouring n6 Birch Polygon;
- **DC1.3 a)** – due to extensive length over permitted limit;
- **DC1.4** – due to inadequate distance to the party wall c 1m.

With respect to Manchester City Council’s Planning Validation Checklist (2018):

12. Accessible accommodation. The proposal includes 0% of accessible accommodation v required 10%

This development is inappropriate for the area, community-destroying in its nature and is contrary to core MCC planning policies. We therefore trust that it will be refused planning permission.

If you require any further information on any of the points above, please contact us using details below.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED], Committee Member and a Planning Rep for Rusholme Ward, Rusholme, Moss Side and Fallowfield Civic Society, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



Dave Morris [REDACTED]

127300/FO/2020 - URN:2019/0866/PLA/02

1 message

To [REDACTED]

29 July 2020 at 09:26

Good Morning

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above proposals, having looked the plans we would have the following comments to make

-

Apartments

- It is recommended that the apartments are fitted with a monitored alarm system with PIR monitors, it should comply with either:
 - BS EN 50131 and PD 6662 for wired systems
 - BS 6799 for wireless systems

- The apartment entrance doors must be compliant with and certified to BS PAS 24. It is advised that these doors do not have fixed sidelights, and are provided with door viewers instead.

Access Control

☐ Access control systems should be operable by swipe card or fob, and not numeric key pads. The following areas/doors should operate on access control:

- Main Entrance
- Door to Cycle Store

Lighting

☐ Dusk 'til dawn lights, operated by photoelectric cell/daylight sensor, should be installed to all external doors (manual override is also permissible).

☐ External lighting must be provided to the side passageway and rear of the building, operated by photoelectric cell/daylight sensor (manual override is also permissible). PIR security lighting is not recommended for these locations and should not be employed unless advised.

☐ Fittings should produce 'white' light, as opposed to yellow/orange light. Metal halide (or bulbs with a comparable output) should be used, as these offer superior colour rendition over alternatives such as high and low pressure sodium bulbs.

Management & Maintenance

1.1.1 The upkeep of a development over its lifetime can be crucial to the level of security and safety within. Aspects of a development, which are left to deteriorate, have the potential to attract further crime – a process known as 'the broken window theory'. A maintenance plan should be drawn up to address issues such as:

- Litter removal
- Repair to communal areas (lighting, signage, access controls)

I hope that this helps and if you need anything further please contact me.

Kind Regards

Sean Bastow Bsc Hons

Designing Out Crime Officer (DOCO)
Assistant Design For Security Consultant

for and on behalf of Greater Manchester Police| Crime Prevention Team

designforsecurity | preventandsecure

Office Address: 4th Floor, Greater Manchester Police Force Headquarters, Northampton Road, Central Park, Manchester, M40 5BP

Postal Address: Design for Security, Greater Manchester Police, Openshaw Complex, [Lawton Street](#), [Openshaw](#), [Manchester](#), [M11 2NS](#)


I♥MCR

COVID-19

To reassure our customers and colleagues, we remain able to offer our full range of services - Crime Impact Statements, Secured by Design, Planning and Design Advice, and assisting Police colleagues.

Please continue to contact the team via the usual channels - email, telephone or website.

You can access many of our services online at www.gmp.police.uk.

For emergencies only call 999, or 101 if it's a less urgent matter.

You can also connect with us on:

- Facebook: www.facebook.com/GtrManchesterPolice
- Twitter: www.twitter.com/gmpolice
- Instagram: www.instagram.com/gtrmanchesterpolice
- Flickr: www.flickr.com/gmpolice1
- YouTube: www.youtube.com/gmpolice
- Pinterest: www.pinterest.co.uk/gmpolice

To find out what is happening in your area, visit www.gmp.police.uk/a/your-area where you will be able to follow local social media accounts.

DISCLAIMER: This message and any attachment may contain information which is confidential or privileged. It is intended for the addressee(s) only. If you have received this message in error, notify the sender and delete it and any attachments without retaining a copy.

Unauthorised use or disclosure of the contact may be unlawful. Any opinions expressed may not be official policy.

Unless encrypted, internet email is not to be treated as a secure means of communication. Greater Manchester Police records and monitors all email activity and content and you are advised that any email you send may be subject to monitoring.

Thank you for your co-operation.



Dave Morris [REDACTED]

Re: Highways response to 127300/FO/2020

1 message

Muniza Usman [REDACTED]

30 July 2020 at 10:19

To: Dave Morris [REDACTED]

Hi Dave

The swept path provided does not appear to have been undertaken using industry standard software and the vehicle size is not shown. Can they advise what software has been used and what vehicle size the track indicates? The two spaces in the front look very tight to access even with reversing in.

Thanks

Kind regards

Muniza Usmani

Engineer

Highways Service, Growth and Neighbourhoods Directorate

(PLEASE NOTE: WORKING FROM HOME UNTIL FURTHER NOTICE)

Email [REDACTED]

Tel [REDACTED]

Web: <http://www.manchester.gov.uk>

POSTAL ADDRESS: Manchester City Council, PO Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester, M60 2LA

On Wed, 29 Jul 2020 at 13:52, Dave Morris [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi Muniza

Thank you for your comments. The swept paths are shown on the site layout drawing.

Regards

Dave Morris

Planner

Development Management South

Planning, Building Control and Licensing

Growth and Development Directorate

Postal Address

Manchester City Council

Planning

PO box 532

Town Hall

Manchester

M60 2LA

Mobile [REDACTED]

E-mail [REDACTED]

<http://www.manchester.gov.uk>

On Wed, 29 Jul 2020 at 12:37, [REDACTED] wrote:

Please see attached document with highways comments on 127300/FO/2020

Regards,

Muniza Usmani



Memorandum

To Dave Morris

From Muniza Usmani

Date

Subject 127300/FO/2020

Erection of a single storey rear extension and conversion of property to provide 5 no. self contained apartments with associated elevational alterations, car parking and landscaping

We have reviewed the above application in relation to highways and our comments are as follows:

127300
8 Birch Polygon

Erection of a single storey rear extension and conversion of property to provide 5 no. self contained apartments (2 no. 1 bedroom, 2 no. 2 bedroom and 1 no. 3 bedroom) with associated elevational alterations, car parking and landscaping.

Adopted highway extends to the back of the footway. There are no kerbside restrictions in Birch Polygon. The site is considered suitably accessible by public transport via bus services operating along Dickenson Road.

A reasonable level of on street car parking was observed, with some vehicles parked with 2 wheels on the footway.

HIGHWAYS COMMENTS

TRIPS

The addition of 5 flats is not expected to generate any additional trips that would impact highway safety or operation.

ACCESS

It appears that the existing access will be used to access and egress the site. However the access seems to be narrow, the width of the available access should be confirmed. It should also be confirmed that a standard vehicle can adequately access and egress the site in a forward gear - this should be supported with a suitable swept path assessment.

No detail is provided regarding the boundary treatment, it is recommended that boundary treatments are visually permeable from a distance of 600mm upwards to ensure that child pedestrians are visible when accessing / egressing a site.

Should the planning application be approved, and if driveway access amendments are required the applicant will be required to enter into a Section 184 agreement. This will need discussion and agreement with the MCC Highways Applications and Network Resilience teams via Contact Manchester (Tel. 0161 234 5004).

CAR PARKING

It is proposed that 5 car parking spaces will be provided on site at the rear/front of the property. Although this allocation represents 100% , MCC Highways recommend that the 3 bedroom flat should have 2 spaces allocated - so ideally there should be 6 on-site spaces provided.

Confirmation is sought that the spaces are a minimum 2.4m wide x 4.8m length separated by a 6m aisle width. It is also recommended that 1 space is allocated as an accessible space - this should be a minimum 3.6m wide x 6.0m length.

CYCLE PARKING

Cycle parking is to be provided in the basement. To encourage sustainable travel, MCC Highways recommends that 100% (5 spaces) on site cycle parking provision is provided. This should be secure and weatherproofed.

WASTE

The plans indicate that bins will be stored at the side of the property and it is expected that residents will bring bins to the roadside on collection days. This arrangement is considered appropriate.

CONSTRUCTION

As this is a constrained residential area, it is recommended that a Construction Management Plan is provided by the applicant prior to any construction works beginning. This should include the type and frequency of construction vehicles expected with appropriate swept path assessment and it should also identify location for loading and unloading of vehicles and arrangements for contractor parking. Any requirement for licenses, hoarding, temporary traffic management etc. should be directed to the MCC Network Resilience teams via Contact Manchester (Tel. 0161 234 5004).

Highways Reference: 10750/FO/2020

Re: FW: Pre-commencement conditions for application 127300/FO/2020

1 message

Muniza Usmani [REDACTED]

26 August 2020 at 12:06

To: Dave Morris [REDACTED]

Hi Dave

That's fine.

Thanks

Muniza Usmani
Engineer
Highways Service, Growth and Neighbourhoods Directorate

email [REDACTED]

tel [REDACTED]

Working days: Tuesday to Friday
(Please note due to Covid-19 working from home until further notice)

On Wed, 26 Aug 2020, 11:55 Dave Morris, [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi Muniza

Please find attached the applicants response to your comments regarding swept paths.

Regards

Dave Morris
Planner
Development Management South
Planning, Building Control and Licensing
Growth and Development Directorate

Postal Address

Manchester City Council
Planning
PO box 532
Town Hall
Manchester
M60 2LA

Mobile [REDACTED]

E-mail [REDACTED]

<http://www.manchester.gov.uk>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Paul Watson** [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, 10 Aug 2020 at 08:10
Subject: RE: FW: Pre-commencement conditions for application 127300/FO/2020
To: Dave Morris [REDACTED]

Dear Dave,

Further to your email below, attached is an updated site plan which has been annotated to show the width of the site where the proposed parking areas are located.

As you will see we have 11 metres. This provides for a 5 metre deep parking space with 6 metres behind each space to allow for reversing. I understand that this is a fairly standard arrangement for site parking i.e. that you would generally seek 6 metres clear for reversing from each space.

I trust that this allays any concerns regarding the usability of the spaces but do please let me know if you still require tracking drawings.

Kind regards

Paul

Paul Watson

BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

Director

Phillips Planning Services Ltd

Registered no: 2696302

Registered Office England and Wales

Tel - [REDACTED]

Fax [REDACTED]

Mob – [REDACTED]

E-mail [REDACTED]

Website - www.phillips-planning.co.uk

Disclaimer

The Information in this message is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this message by any other person is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. Unless otherwise stated the content of this email is only governed by English Law

From: Dave Morris [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 July 2020 13:43
To: Paul Watson [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: FW: Pre-commencement conditions for application 127300/FO/2020

Hi Paul

I have received the following comments from our highways engineers.

"The swept path provided does not appear to have been undertaken using industry standard software and the vehicle size is not shown. Can they advise what software has been used and what vehicle size the track indicates? The two spaces in the front look very tight to access even with reversing in."

Regards

Dave Morris

Planner

Development Management South

Planning, Building Control and Licensing

Growth and Development Directorate

Postal Address

Manchester City Council

Planning

PO box 532

Town Hall

Manchester

M60 2LA

Mobile [REDACTED]

E-mail [REDACTED]

<http://www.manchester.gov.uk>

On Wed, 29 Jul 2020 at 16:24, Paul Watson [REDACTED] wrote:

Ahh, ok, I did read the:

Please note that this information is provided without prejudice to any final decision in relation to this application

I assumed that was other wording for still could be overturned at committee etc.

I haven't had an authority send out draft conditions before they had come to a generally supportive view.

Anyway, I was hoping that it may be supportive from a selfish perspective as I have been instructed to get on and submit an Appeal against the LDC refusal and obviously if this goes ahead we don't need that so I was probably being too optimistic!

Kind regards

Paul

Paul Watson*BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI*

Director

Phillips Planning Services Ltd

Registered no: 2696302

Registered Office England and Wales

Tel - [REDACTED]

Fax [REDACTED]

Mob – [REDACTED]

E-mail [REDACTED]

Website - www.phillips-planning.co.ukDisclaimer

The Information in this message is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this message by any other person is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. Unless otherwise stated the content of this email is only governed by English Law

From: Dave Morris [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2020 16:11
To: Paul Watson [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: FW: Pre-commencement conditions for application 127300/FO/2020

Sorry Paul, all it means is that should we determine to approve the application then there will be a pre commencement condition attached. It should be explained in the letter.

Regards

Dave Morris

Planner

Development Management South

Planning, Building Control and Licensing

Growth and Development Directorate

Postal Address

Manchester City Council

Planning

PO box 532

Town Hall

Manchester

M60 2LA

Mobile [REDACTED]

E-mail [REDACTED]

<http://www.manchester.gov.uk>

On Wed, 29 Jul 2020 at 15:23, Paul Watson [REDACTED] wrote:

Dave,

We have no objection to the attached pre-commencement condition.

Does this mean that officers are recommending approval?

Kind regards

Paul

Paul Watson
BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI
Director

Phillips Planning Services Ltd
Registered no: 2696302
Registered Office England and Wales
Tel - [REDACTED]
Fax [REDACTED]
Mob - [REDACTED]
E-mail [REDACTED]
Website - www.phillips-planning.co.uk

Disclaimer

The Information in this message is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this message by any other person is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. Unless otherwise stated the content of this email is only governed by English Law

-----Original Message-----

From [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2020 13:49
To: Paul Watson [REDACTED]
Subject: Pre-commencement conditions for application 127300/FO/2020

Please find attached a letter regarding pre-commencement conditions in relation to your recent application under reference 127300/FO/2020.

Regards,
Dave Morris
Planning, Manchester City Council, P O Box 532, Manchester M60 2LA

--

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.

The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer
<<http://www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer>>.

Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy <<http://www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy>> for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.

Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.

Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
