# Comments for Planning Application 142652/FO/2025

**Application Summary**

Application Number: 142652/FO/2025
Address: Chorlton Square Shopping Centre Barlow Moor Road Manchester M21 9AQ
Proposal: Erection of 6 no. residential buildings of 10, 8, 6 and 4 storeys in height to provide up to 262 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with ground floor commercial uses (Use Class E (a-e)); infrastructure works including electric substation and associated utilities works, basement and ground level car parking, service yard, vehicular and pedestrian accesses; together with public realm works and hard/soft landscaping following the demolition of the existing buildings and structures on site.
Case Officer: Robert Griffin

**Customer Details**

Name: Not Available
Address: Not Available

**Comment Details**

Commenter Type: Neighbour
Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application
Comment Reasons:
Comment:I respectfully request that Manchester City Council REFUSE this application and require a redesign that better aligns with local character, infrastructure capacity, and policy. The OneChorlton proposal is vastly oversized in scale, design, and density for Chorlton. It fails to provide adequate parking, affordable homes, retail viability, public realm, or community infrastructure. It breaches multiple National Planning Policy Framework (2023) sections (130, 92, 185) and Local Plan policies (SP1, EC3, H8). In its current form, it is unsuitable, unsustainable, and harmful to Chorlton's character, as detailed:

Impact on the environment
- The enormous scale (6 residential buildings of 10, 8, 6 and 4 storeys in height to provide up to 262 residential dwellings) far exceeds the low-rise, human scale character of Chorlton and contributes to urban overconcentration. This conflicts with local planning policy (Manchester City Council. (2012). Manchester's Local Development Framework: Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted July 11, 2012; updated with Addendum March 2024). Manchester City Council) SP1 - "scale and massing sympathetic to local character".
- Green space provision is minimal and fails provide enough shared green space for the local community needs or support biodiversity. Plans conflict with national planning policies (e.g. NPPF 174-175), which requires developments to enhance, not degrade, the natural environment.

Impact on traffic and transportation

- Only 12 public parking spaces are proposed for the large development, which is insufficient. Loss of the existing 200-space public car park will force commuters to park on residential streets, intensifying congestion and risking highway safety, which is already an increasing problem. There is no dedicated shopper parking which will severely impact local businesses and increase residential street congestion. As a disabled resident, the plans reduce accessibility, which is becoming more of a problem in the area.
- 164 designated residential parking spots are insufficient, and no visitor parking is included. NPPF 111 requires parking provision that avoids displacement and undue pressure on the local road network.

Impact on noise levels, light, and pollution
- The influx of up to 645 additional residents, combined with increased traffic, garbage collection, and deliveries, will raise ambient noise and air pollution. NPPF 185 mandates protective measures for air quality and noise but the application lacks detailed impact or mitigation reporting.
- Extended construction (likely 4-5 years, including basement works) will cause prolonged disturbance, with risks that appear not to have been properly assessed or communicated to neighbours.
- The proposed development, particularly the tallest blocks reaching up to 10 storeys, will result in significant loss of natural light to neighbouring properties, especially during the winter months when the sun is lower in the sky. This will lead to overshadowing and reduce the daylight available to existing homes, outdoor spaces, and streets, negatively impacting residents' well-being and enjoyment of their properties. The development contravenes Manchester Core Strategy Policy DM1, which requires developments to safeguard residential amenity, including access to daylight and sunlight. It also conflicts with NPPF Paragraph 130, which states that planning decisions should ensure a high standard of amenity for existing and future residents. Furthermore, the plans appear inconsistent with BRE daylight/sunlight guidance, widely used to assess acceptable light levels in urban design.

Impact on the character and appearance of the area
- At up to 10 storeys, the tallest block is incongruous within Chorlton's predominantly 2-3 storey village-style streetscape, including the conservation character around local areas (e.g. Chorltonville)
- This scale, massing, sightlines, and loss of iconic precinct retail frontage will significantly diminish local visual amenity. It fails to comply with NPPF 130 that requires "sympathetic" design.

Impact on neighbouring properties and privacy
- The height and proximity of tall blocks create overlooking and shading of neighbouring homes on Wilbraham and Norris Roads. Residents' amenity, day lighting, and privacy will be compromised, contravening NPPF 130(f), which requires new development not to "unreasonably overshadow or intrude on the privacy of surrounding occupiers."

Impact on local amenities and services

- Retail space is drastically reduced: commercial space drops from 34,600 sq ft to just over 12,000 sq ft, with no anchor store such as 'Quality Save' which was the only affordable shopping store in Chorlton. This threatens Chorlton's viability as a vibrant district centre and disadvantages local residents by denying them access to affordable shops. The development effectively destroys the "centre" of Chorlton and risks economic decline for independent traders. NPPF 92 and Local Plan EC3 require developments to support vibrant town centres.
- The development proposes only 49 affordable homes (19%), well below Manchester Core Strategy Policy H8 requirement of 30%; a shortfall in addressing genuine local housing need.
- No provision is made for new GPs, schools, or other service capacity, even though UK Infrastructure Delivery Schedules highlight these as essential for community growth democracy.manchester.gov.uk. This omission will strain already stretched local health and education services.