

Comments for Planning Application 137226/FO/2023

Application Summary

Application Number: 137226/FO/2023

Address: Part Of Plot C And Plot E Great Jackson Street Manchester M15 4NP

Proposal: Full planning permission for the demolition of existing structures and the phased construction of four residential buildings (two at 47 storeys and two at 51 storeys) to provide 1,746 homes (Use Class C3), flexible commercial, leisure, food and drink uses (all Use Class E) and / or drinking establishment (Sui Generis), basement car parking, cycle parking, landscaping and public realm, servicing and access arrangements, highways alterations and associated works.

Case Officer: Lucy Harrison

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Impact of Increase in Traffic

Increased traffic in the area is to be expected with the construction of four additional towers.

Building E1 is planned to have a car park entrance on Owen St. Owen St. is a narrow street which already gets very crowded in its current state.

It is stated in the Framework Travel Plan that the traffic flow on Owen St is controlled by barriers. This is inaccurate information. The traffic on Owen St has not been controlled in that way for at least 3 years as it was impractical. Furthermore the barriers have now been removed.

It is also stated that Owen St has red lines, but these are regularly ignored by delivery drivers as well as vehicle registered abroad which are common occurrences due to the occupancy demographics of the towers.

As a consequence of the numerous vehicles parked on the stretch which will be co-shared with towers E1 and E2, vehicles often swerve onto the pedestrian area when passing another vehicle. It is also worth noting that that area is used as terrace by restaurants like Salvi's.

The addition of a car park entrance on Owen St will increase the risk of accidents and injury to pedestrians either using the pavement or a restaurant's terrace. The increase in vehicles passing each other will also increase the risk to other road users. It will also contribute to higher pollution levels around the towers, as vehicles struggle to pass one another, as well as increased noise levels well into the night as amounts of food deliveries and taxis remain high on the Deansgate Square turning circle until at least midnight and even later over weekends.

Apart from Owen St, other road infrastructures appear inadequate. Referring to report Transport_Note from Curtins, it is difficult to understand how estimates of vehicles has been

reached. The population of the Deansgate Square towers is made in majority of wealthy students and young professionals who tend to travel by taxis when going out. What we witness at Deansgate Square during term time, i.e. when the buildings are at full capacity, are vehicles queuing to get onto the turning circle. We easily see three times the number of taxis per tower picking up people on the turning circle. It seems a reasonable assumption that the lifestyle of the towers will not differ significantly. There are regular occurrences of vehicles queuing on Owen St. when there are already 5 vehicles parked on the outer circle and 3 double parked on the inside. It is therefore reasonable to expect a lot more than 22 taxis per hour between the hours of 8 and 9 in the evening.

Aside from taxis, a lot of food deliveries take place. It is, again, difficult to understand how Curtins came up with figures for loading bay requirements for loading bays. Curiously, peak times for servicing vehicles are between 10 and 11am and 4 and 5pm. The peak time that can be observed at Deansgate Square is between the hours of 7 and 10pm, when a lot of the food gets delivered by cars. Delivery drivers regularly complain that there is nowhere for them to stop, and some have even threatened to stop delivering to the towers.

Given that the entrance to the car park for E1 will be on Owen St., and that the exit for E2 loading bay users is a one way path into Owen St., it is not difficult to imagine the seriously chaotic and dangerous situations which will arise from the current proposal. It is also proposed to reduce a portion of Owen St down to one lane, which will further exacerbate the situation and cause even more vehicles to climb onto pedestrian areas. The proposed traffic control measure which is to limit the traffic with bollards is also naïve and completely impractical for the numbers of vehicles which will be using the area (there used to be controlled access via barriers for Deansgate Square and these were dropped very quickly as the concierge desk could not effectively manage the flow of vehicles and queues would form behind the barriers onto Deansgate in front of the West Tower and blocking entrance to Deansgate Square car park).

So based on the above, I would like to comment that the road infrastructure on the planning application is inadequate both on Owen St and on the loading bays. The current proposal will lead to a higher risk exposure for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users, and increased air and noise pollution.

Finally, it is questionable as to whether the assessment by Curtins is valid at all. Curtins seem to be under the impression that C7 and C8 are smaller towers than E1 and E2. It is easy to see from the Elevation drawings that that is not the case. So when Curtins state that "there could be instances on Towers C7 and C8 ... when theoretical demands slightly exceeds the supply of loading spaces", that conclusion is drawn on estimates which are even lower than they will be in reality. Given that Curtins developed their entire assessment on the wrong sizing of the towers, it is really doubtful whether the entire report can be relied on for informed decision making.

Natural Daylight - Deansgate Square

The GIA report states that, as a whole, Deansgate Square will retain average daylight comparable with similar types of developments and that residents of Deansgate Square have been aware for several years of proposed developments.

The second part of the statement is completely untrue. In fact, it is very surprising that Renaker,

the applicant, have not asked GIA to correct these statements in the report as Renaker themselves have been advertising properties in the marketing suite with much smaller buildings on the plots discussed. Numerous photos of the models are available and other photos are part of the Great Jackson Street Development Framework authored by Deloitte. Many Deansgate Square residents have bought properties based on the natural daylight the properties would offer for years to come.

The GIA report comments on the daylight situation as an average. It is clear from the visuals on figure 16 that pretty much the entirety of the West facing side of the North Tower will be left with low level lighting. The situation is almost similar for the West side of East Tower. When combined with the other 71 floor proposed development on plot D and the new constructions currently rising on the South and West side, circa 2/3rds of apartments on the South Tower will be left with very little daylight. The report itself seems incomplete. The assessment focuses on only one side of some key buildings. This is the case for South Tower, for example, which will be impacted on three sides. The South face will be impacted by plot D (no figure), the West face will be impacted by plot D and C7/C8/E1/E2 and the North Face will be impacted by C7/C8/E1/E2 (no figure). Curiously, whilst the report fails to show before and after (called existing and proposed in the report) for buildings heavily impacted by the loss of sunlight, for example the West side of Deansgate Square North Tower, it happily volunteers before and after for apartment blocks completely unaffected by the towers (like City South). With these kinds of inconsistencies, one cannot help but feel that the report has not been written in a completely neutral way.

Another well-known impact of the change in lighting conditions for so many apartments will also result in an increased need for internal lighting and heating, and thereby an increase in CO2 emissions. The environmental impact assessment for this planning application does not take that into account.

Residents of Deansgate Square have access to a green area on the West facing side of North Tower called the Roof Garden. Due to its positioning, the Roof Garden is a very windy place, and therefore unless warmth provided by natural sunlight is present, it is not a very welcoming place. The Roof Garden is used a lot less use than it used to at the beginning following the construction of the four towers on the West side of the Great Jackson development. Direct sunlight is now available early afternoon and late afternoon, but there is a gap mid-afternoon when the sun is behind the four towers opposite. The combination of the proposed 72 floor tower and the four towers in this application will effectively deprive all the residents from their only private green space, as there will be no direct sunlight ever reaching the Roof Garden as can clearly be seen from figure 16 of the Gia report. It is worth noting that this green space has often been used for events designed to create a community at Deansgate Square. So the proposed development will impact not only residents' wellbeing from a natural sunlight point of view, but it will also make it more difficult for them to belong to a community, which, as we know, also has a number of positive impact on crime rate, wellbeing, antisocial behaviour, loneliness, and other.

The Roof Garden is also the only child-friendly place within the Deansgate Square environment. There are no places in the entire development where children can go and play apart from the Roof Garden. The next closest place is the playground outside Crown Street School, and that playground will also be without any direct natural sunlight if the proposed development goes

ahead.

Considering a lot of properties were sold to purchasers on the belief, reinforced by drawings and models, that their apartment would benefit from high levels of direct light and that they would be able to enjoy a green, communal, child-friendly, place in the Roof Garden, it is not acceptable, and could even be considered as dishonesty and misselling, that an application for a completely different development which will impact the daylight of so many apartments in such a drastic way has been submitted. The situation for Deansgate Square should not be looked at as an average, but should really focus on the West facing sides of the South, East and North towers, and disregard the negligible impact of West Tower which is geographically detached from the other three towers. The application is also in direct contradiction with the Greater Jackson Development Framework, two pillars of which are "maximising separation distances between buildings" and "enhancing sunlight and daylight penetration into the site".