

From: **Fitzgerald, Eithne** < >
Date: Fri, 27 Mar 2020 at 11:03
Subject: RE: [EXT] Re: London Warehouse Application
To: Carolyn Parry < >
Cc: Wray, Katie < >, Marema, Lerato < >

Hi Carolyn,

No problem!

Thank you for the below, I have noted our comments on each of your points below in green.

If possible, could you give us an indication of the date when the application might be ready for validation? I appreciate it has been a fairly unprecedented couple of weeks, but our client is looking for an update on the application as it has been almost three weeks since submission.

Many thanks,

Eithne Fitzgerald

Assistant Planner | FA - Real Estate | Deloitte LLP
www.deloitterealestate.co.uk

From: Carolyn Parry < >
Sent: 27 March 2020 07:47
To: Fitzgerald, Eithne < >
Subject: [EXT] Re: London Warehouse Application

Eithne,

Sorry for the delay in coming back you on this. I had to leave the office on Wednesday last week at very short notice.

I have been working at home this week and we have been migrating over to a new electronic system for the validation of applications. As this application came in when were on the old paper system, I have been waiting for it to become available on the electronic system so that I can generate a validation letter. It isn't available yet, but I am unable to validate the application anyway for the following reasons:

1. The submission contains no photographs of the existing terrace and location for the new lower terrace. Where applications involve listed buildings, even though you have not submitted an LBC in this instance, we require photos of the heritage asset affected. **Please find photos attached.**
2. There is no design and access statement to accompany the proposal. There should be a specific section on disabled access for example to both the terraces, how people would move from the inside to the outside of the building and how they would move between the different levels.

However as per the Planning Portal guidance referenced in your validation checklist and statute, a DAS is not required for this type of application.

https://www.planningportal.co.uk/faqs/faq/51/what_is_a_design_and_access_statement

Statute extract: 8.—(1) Subject to paragraph (4), this article applies to an application for planning permission which is for—

- a) development which is major development;
- b) where any part of the development is in a designated area, development consisting of—
 - i) the provision of one or more dwellinghouses; or
 - ii) the provision of a building or buildings where the floor space created by the development is 100 square metres or more.

We can provide a short statement on disabled access if required – please let us know and we will liaise with the team today.

3. The application also contains no information on the reinstatement of the cobbles. Where would the cobbles be sourced from? Information, and photos, should be contained in the submission for the existing cobbles and details of how these would be matched.

The cover letter states that the original cobbles will be reinstated and this was confirmed in email to MCC prior to submission. The applicant has stored the original cobbles from the space prior to the bin store being created last year. It is these cobbles that will be put back. No photos or matching is required as they are the original.

4. Please can you also explain the design evolution for the proposal and why the proposal has now changed from that which we looked at a few months ago. There is a concern regarding the covering over of the existing cobbles which was not proposed previously.

The previous proposal was more intrusive as it involved larger structures being fixed to the listed building and would have had a higher visual impact than the proposed. The evolved proposal does not involve any fixings to the listed building and therefore there is no direct impact on the listed building. Although the cobbles will be covered, the terrace will be raised, with no direct impact on the cobbles. The proposal is also reversible. There is also a significant heritage benefit with the visually intrusive bin store being moved and original cobbles being reinstated. Finally the original proposal required quite a significant outlay for a minimal gain on space. Overall the evolved proposal provides a better solution in terms of impact on the listed building and operational need of the client.

Hopefully by the time this information comes back, the application will be able to be validated on the new electronic system.

Regards

Carolyn

Carolyn Parry
Planner
Development Management - City Centre
Planning

Growth and Development Directorate
Manchester City Council
Level 6, Town Hall Extension