

Comments for Planning Application 129020/FO/2020

Application Summary

Application Number: 129020/FO/2020

Address: Oakley 188 Wilmslow Road Manchester M14 6LJ

Proposal: Erection of 1 no. 13 storey building and 1 no. part 4 and part 5 storey building to form purpose built student accommodation together with a single storey side and rear extension to the retained and refurbished Oakley Villa and conversion to form amenity and communal space together with associated landscaping, cycle parking, car parking and associated works following the demolition of existing office accommodation on the site

Case Officer: Robert Griffin

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I write as a former resident (for 42 years) in Rusholme and former Secretary of the Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society and wish to voice formal objection to the proposed development, especially the proposal to erect a 13 storey purpose-built student accommodation. I know from experience that we have always resisted, successfully, the erection of high-rise buildings in Rusholme and Fallowfield (for instance, the proposal for a tower block on the Langdale Hall site). The one existing such building (Owens Park tower) is due for demolition and three other buildings (the two blocks of flats opposite Platt Fields and the 'toast rack' are far less than 13 storeys. The area is virtually free of high-rise buildings and this should remain a characteristic of the two districts. Moreover, this particular development will overlook the park and the neighbouring school, which seems especially undesirable.

There is a further problem associated with the provision of student accommodation. Hitherto PBSA has been confined to the East side of Wilmslow Road where proposals to re-develop the Fallowfield campus have included student amenities in order to mitigate the impact on the local community. The present proposal will place a substantial student concentration in a confined area of small streets with no ameliorating amenities. This can only increase problems of parking, litter accumulation and noise during unsocial hours and do nothing to address the existing problems which deter non-student residential occupation.

Finally, I realise that the economics of re-development schemes often require the inclusion of a building that will produce maximum income in proportion to its footprint (ie high-rise), so this calls

into question the ambitious re-development along Langley Road. Surely, a more modest refurbishment scheme that keeps the existing building in Langley Road would be a better solution.