Consultation list for appeal APP/B4215/W/18/3192613
Appeal at Public Highway, London Road (adjacent To Macdonald Manchester Hotel), Manchester, M1 2PG

Highway Services, Hammerstone Road Depot, Gorton, Manchester, M18 8EQ
Greater Manchester Police, 4th Floor Greater Manchester Police HQ, Northampton Road, Central Park, Manchester, M40 5BP
Greater Manchester Pedestrians Society, 12 Tarleton Walk, Longsight, Manchester, M13 9ET
Councillor Adele Douglas, C/o Member's Services, P O Box 532, Town Hall Extension, Manchester M60 2LA
Councillor Jon-Connor Lyons, C/o Member's Services, P O Box 532, Town Hall Extension, Manchester M60 2LA
Councillor Sam Wheeler, C/o Member's Services, P O Box 532, Town Hall Extension, Manchester M60 2LA
Macdonald Hotels & Resorts, London Road, Manchester, M1 2PG

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Rebecca Hadfield
Telephone: 0161 234 4071
r.hadfield@manchester.gov.uk

P O Box 532 Town Hall
Manchester M60 2LA

The Owner/Occupier

Date: 12 October 2018

Dear Sir/Madam,

Town & Country Planning Act 1990
Planning application reference: 116270/TEL/2017
Planning Inspectorate reference: APP/B4215/W/18/3192613
Appellant's name: Maximus Networks Ltd
Development: Prior Approval for the installation of a telephone kiosk
Location: Public Highway, London Road (adjacent To Macdonald Manchester Hotel), Manchester, M1 2PG
Appeal start date: 12 October 2018

I am writing to inform you that an appeal has been made in respect of the above matter.

The appeal follows the refusal of the City Council to grant planning permission for the above-mentioned development. The reasons for refusing the application are as follows:

1) The proposed telephone kiosk, by virtue of its siting and appearance, would constitute an unduly assertive and visually intrusive incongruous feature within the street scene. It would be harmful to visual amenity and add to street clutter within an area of high amenity value, in a prominent location in the area. It would have a negative effect upon regeneration efforts and improvements to the environment taking place within the City Centre and, as a consequence, would have a detrimental impact on the overall image of the City Centre. For this reason, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Sections 1 (Ensuring the Vitality of Town Centres), 4 (Promoting Sustainable Transport), 7 (Requiring Good Design) and 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies DM1 (Development Management), EN3 (Heritage), EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas), CC9 (Design and Heritage) and SP1 (Spatial Principles) of the Adopted Core Strategy for the City of Manchester and saved policies E3.3 (Environmental Improvement and Protection), DC17.1 (Telecommunications), DC18.1 (Conservation Areas) and DC19.1 (Listed Buildings) of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester and policies 2 (Design), 8 (Community Safety and Crime Prevention) and 9 (Design for Health) of the 'Guide to Development in Manchester' Supplementary Planning Document.

2) The proposed telephone kiosk, by virtue of its siting and appearance, would constitute an unduly assertive and visually intrusive incongruous feature within the street scene, and as a consequence have a detrimental impact upon visual amenity within the area, and views into the adjacent Whitworth Street Conservation Area. For this reason, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Sections 7 (Requiring Good Design) and 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework; Policies SP1 (Spatial Principles), CC9 (Design and Heritage), EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas), EN3 (Heritage) and DM1 (Development Management) of the Adopted Core Strategy for the City of Manchester; and saved policy DC18.1 (Conservation Areas) of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester.

3) The proposed telephone kiosk, by virtue of its siting and appearance, would constitute an unduly assertive and visually intrusive incongruous feature within the street scene. It would

interrupt views of the Grade II Listed Viaduct, and would have a detrimental impact upon this heritage asset, and visual amenity within an area of high amenity value. For this reason, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Sections 7 (Requiring Good Design) and 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework; Policies SP1 (Spatial Principles), CC9 (Design and Heritage), EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas), EN3 (Heritage) and DM1 (Development Management) of the Adopted Core Strategy for the City of Manchester; and saved policy DC19.1 (Listed Buildings) of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester.

4) The proposed telephone kiosk by virtue of its siting and appearance would provide increased opportunities for anti-social behaviour, misuse, vandalism, and fly-posting, thereby increasing crime and disorder in the area, creating an unsafe environment for people visiting, living and working in the area. For this reason, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Sections 1 (Ensuring the Vitality of Town Centres) 4 (Promoting Sustainable Transport) and 7 (Requiring Good Design) of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies T1 (Sustainable Transport), CC4 (Visitors, Tourism, Culture and Leisure), CC10 (A Place for Everyone), DM1 (Development Management), EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas) and SP1 (Spatial Principles) of the Adopted Core Strategy for the City of Manchester and Policies 2 (Design), 8 (Community Safety and Crime Prevention) and 9 (Design for Health) of the 'Guide to Development in Manchester' Supplementary Planning Document and saved policy E3.3 (Environmental Improvement and Protection) of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester.

5) The proposed telephone kiosk by virtue of its siting and appearance, within an area subject to high pedestrian footfall and high vehicle activity, would reduce the width of available footway and affect sightlines, causing a safety risk for road users. For this reason, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Sections 1 (Ensuring the Vitality of Town Centres) 4 (Promoting Sustainable Transport), 7 (Requiring Good Design) of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CC4 (Visitors, Tourism, Culture and Leisure), CC10 (A Place for Everyone), DM1 (Development Management), EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas) and SP1 (Spatial Principles) of the Adopted Core Strategy for the City of Manchester and Policies 2 (Design), 8 (Community Safety and Crime Prevention) and 9 (Design for Health) of the 'Guide to Development in Manchester' Supplementary Planning Document and saved policy E3.3 (Environmental Improvement and Protection) of the Unitary Development Plan for Manchester.

The appeal is to be decided on the basis of an exchange of written statements by the parties and a site inspection by the Inspector, appointed by the Planning Inspectorate, to decide this appeal.

The purpose of this letter is to give you the opportunity of making your views known to the Inspector.

If you have already written to the City Planning Officer at Manchester your correspondence will be sent to the Planning Inspectorate and copied to the Appellant. You may at this stage of the proceedings make any additional or new comments online using the Planning Casework Service at https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ or in writing directly to the Planning Inspectorate (enclosing three copies if possible) to the following address: The Planning Inspectorate, 3/21 Eagle Wing, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol BS1 6PN.

The Planning Inspectorate will not acknowledge your letter unless you specifically ask them to do so. They will however, ensure that your letter is passed on to the Inspector dealing with the appeal. Please ensure that any representations, which you wish to make on this appeal, are received by the Planning Inspectorate by the **16 November 2018**, otherwise there is a risk that your representations will not be considered. Please remember to quote the Planning Inspectorate reference number on all correspondence.

A copy of the decision relating to this appeal will be published on the gov.uk website at the conclusion of the appeal process.

In the meantime, if you require any further information or wish to inspect Appeal documentation kindly telephone Rebecca Hadfield on the above extension.

Yours sincerely,



Julie Roscoe
Head of Planning, Building Control & Licensing