MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning

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

P O Box 532 Town Hall
Manchester M60 2LA

Mr Tom Fisher
Euro Payphone Ltd
PO Box 4846
Maidenhead
SL4 9ER

Date: 10 July 2017

Dear Sir/Madam,

Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) (England) 2015 Schedule 2, Part 16
Application No: 116343/TEL/2017
Prior Approval for the installation of a telephone kiosk at Outside 3 St Marys Gate, Manchester, M1 1PX

I write with reference to the above application and advise you that prior approval will be required for the siting and appearance of the proposed apparatus.

In this case, prior approval is **refused** for the following reason(s):

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 City Centre. It would have a negative effect upon regeneration efforts and improvements to the environment taking place within the area, 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 St Anns Square 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 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.

4) 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 the footway, and affect sightlines, creating 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.

Should you wish to discuss this matter any further please contact Rebecca Hadfield.

Yours faithfully,



Julie Roscoe
Head of Planning, Building Control & Licensing