Consultation list for appeal APP/B4215/W/17/3190043
Appeal at 1 Piccadilly Gardens, Manchester, M1 1RG

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 Kevin Peel, Apartment 80, 1 Blantyre Street, Manchester, M15 4JU
Councillor Joan Davies, Flat 19, 91 Liverpool Road, Manchester, M3 4JN

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

Christopher Smith
Telephone: 0161 234 4529
christopher.smith@manchester.gov.uk

P O Box 532 Town Hall
Manchester M60 2LA

Ward Councillors

Date: 25 April 2018

Dear Sir or Madam,

Town & Country Planning Act 1990
Planning application reference: 116345/TEL/2017
Planning Inspectorate reference: APP/B4215/W/17/3190043
Appellant's name: Mr Tom Fisher Euro Payphone Ltd
Development: Prior Approval for the installation of a telephone kiosk
Location: 1 Piccadilly Gardens, Manchester, M1 1RG
Appeal start date: 19 April 2018

I am writing to inform you that an appeal has been made in respect of the above matter. This is one of a number of linked appeals by the same appellant for the same or similar proposal in different locations. The details of the linked appeal cases can be found at the end of this letter.

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, and would be harmful to visual amenity and add to street clutter within an area of high amenity value, in a prominent location in the City Centre. It would have a negative effect upon regeneration efforts and improvements to the environment taking place within the City Centre and, as a consequence 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 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.
3) The proposed telephone kiosk would adversely affect the width and permeability of the public footpath, this would impede pedestrians, wheelchair and pushchair users to conveniently and safely manoeuvre. The pavement is very busy with heavy footfall. This in turn would make access even more difficult and as such, the safety of users of the public footway would be significantly compromised. the proposed kiosk would be located at the front of the pavement which would restrict views for pedestrians crossing the road, which would be a safety risk for road users. Therefore, the proposed development is considered to be inconsistent with sections 1, and 2 of the NPPF and Core Strategy policies EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas) and CC7 (Mixed Use Development) as well as Manchester City Centre Strategic Plan - The Manchester City Centre Strategic Plan (published in 2009) by reason of the following:
4) The proposed kiosk, by virtue of its size, siting and design, would have a detrimental impact upon the visual amenity of the area and the settings of a Grade II listed structure named ' Wellington's Statue. The proposal is therefore 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 policies DC19.1 (Listed Buildings).

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 **24 May 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 Christopher Smith on the above extension.

Yours sincerely,



Julie Roscoe

The following appeals are linked as child appeals to the above case:

Appeal Reference	Address	Post Code	Planning Application Ref
3190041	Pavement outside 49-51 Piccadilly	M1 2AP	116986/TEL/2017
3190047	Pavement outside 39 Parker Street	M1 4AJ	116439/TEL/2017
3190053	Outside 6A Piccadilly Plaza	M1 4AJ	116346/TEL/2017
3190057	Pavement outside Heron House, Albert Square	M2 4EG	116349/TEL/2017
3190061	Pavement outside 2-10 Albert Square	M2 5HD	116992/TEL/2017
3190119	Pavement outside Arndale Centre car park, Shudehill	M4 4AF	116532/TEL/2017
3190289	Pavement outside 15 Corporation Street	M1 1WT	119985/TEL/2017