

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 139286/FO/2024
Date registered valid: 8 March 2024
Proposal: Erection of four storey building to form four residential apartments (Use Class C3a) following demolition of existing building.
Address: Vanilla, 39 - 41 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
Ward(s): Piccadilly Ward

Applicant: Mr Craig Elder
Agent (if any): Dr Kanadi Jagafa Mason and Marlowe Ltd
Case officer: Angela Leckie
Tel: 0161 234 4651
Email: angela.leckie@manchester.gov.uk
Recommendation: Refuse
Date of recommendation: 24-04-24

Application details

Type of application: Full Application Consent
Development type: Minor Dwellings
Date of site visit: 27-03-24

Standard consultations:

Printed: 20 March 2024 Expired: 12 April 2024

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 20 March 2024 Expired: 12 April 2024

Site notice

Posted: 27-03-24 Expired: 19-04-24

Press advert

Published: 26 March 2024 Expired: 9 April 2024

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Whitworth Street Conservation Area 1985

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

The application relates to a 79sqm site occupied by a 2 storey Georgian property known as 39-41 Richmond Street. There is an extension at the rear of the building, a narrow two-storey projection at the south-east corner and a single storey lean-to on the rest of the rear elevation. Both have mono-pitched roofs, albeit angled in opposite directions, and both are constructed of brick, part rendered in places. The building has a grey rendered façade and pitched roof. The site faces onto Richmond Street and there is a service ginnel to the rear. The building is currently vacant but was most recently used as a bar / nightclub known as Vanilla. There is a surface level car park adjacent to the exposed gable wall of the building at the junction of Sackville Street and Richmond Street.

Damage to the render on the north-west elevation shows the building is brick built, and two vertical protrusions against this elevation may be buttresses.

Buildings heights on Canal Street range from 2 to 6 storeys, with those around Chorlton Street, Abingdon Street, Bloom Street and Richmond Street being between 2 and 5 storeys.

The building is located in the Whitworth Conservation Area and is adjacent to a number of listed buildings, including the Grade II listed former warehouse at 27 Sackville Street, the former warehouses at 51-53 and 58 Richmond Street and 33 Sackville Street.

On account of its high historic interest and rarity, the building is considered a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) and an important contributor to the sense of place, sense of history and overall special significance of the Whitworth Conservation Area.

The site is close to Piccadilly and Oxford Road Railway Stations, Metro link, Chorlton Street Bus Station, Metroshuttle services and a wide range of bus services. It falls within Flood Risk Zone 1 and is at low risk of flooding from rivers or sea. It is within a critical drainage area.

Description of area

The site is within part of the City Centre known as The Village. The area contains a mix of uses including office, restaurants and bars, leisure and shops. There is a row of recently completed townhouses on Richmond Street opposite the application site at 43-49 and a number of buildings in the area have been converted to apartments including the upper floors of 109 Princess Street, 27 Sackville Street and 42-44 Sackville Street.

Description of development

Consent is sought for the demolition of the existing building on the site and erection of four storey building to form four residential apartments (Use Class C3a). There would be a single 1 bedroom apartment and 3 x 2 bedroom apartments. A lift would provide access between floors.

The proposed building would have brick facades on the ground, 1st and 2nd floors and another unspecified material to the 4th floor mansard roof which would feature dormer windows. The elevations would be punctuated by UPVC crittal style windows to all 3 facades and UPVC doors

with headers in an unspecified material. The building would feature banding in an unspecified material between the ground and 1st floor and the 3rd and 4th floors and there would be a turret on the roof at the junction of the site with Richmond Street and the surface level car park. There would be classical-style architraves to the entrances.

There would be a bin store and cycle store located within the ground floor. Energy needs would be met through an all electric system which would include air source heat pumps.

Mitigation for the loss of the building comprising a Historic Building Recording, to Historic England Level 2 Standard, to provide a photographing record of the building to supplement the information gathered for the submitted Heritage Statement has been offered by the applicant as part of the proposals.

Consultations & Notification Responses

Publicity – The application was advertised as a public interest development affecting the setting of a listed building and the character of a conservation area. Occupiers of adjacent properties have been notified about the application. 13 letters of objection and 3 letters of support have been received. These are summarised below:

Objections:

Use

- Residential accommodation threatens businesses, nightlife and culture in this area.
- This is essentially on the corner of the heart of the Gay Village surrounding bars and day/nightlife. The apartments would encroach on this and apartments replacing these bars is diminishing a crucial part of Manchester culture, particularly for minorities.
- Residents there will be in the middle of the gay village location, and may find the location too loud to comfortably habituate.
- We've seen time and time again how erecting apartment buildings in areas that thrive on music and nightlife ends.
- Continued encroachment of residential buildings in this area is going to make this area as unsafe for LGBT people as the rest of Manchester. Please consider our community in the one place in the city we can be safer.
- Our concern is that the 'Agent of Change' principal must apply in that the developer is to be held wholly responsible for any noise issues experienced by residents in the property and that any noise impact assessment must include the peak weekend trading times for Canal Street area (between 11:00pm and 04:00am)

We are concerned that other historic music and entertainment venues in Manchester City Centre have been adversely affected by noise complaints from residential properties that were developed in areas known for late night entertainment. If the famous Manchester night life is to be preserved then residential developers must fully demonstrate due diligence in the accuracy of the noise assessments at peak trading times, followed by the requisite measures within the structure to avoid nuisance to any residents.

Design

- This would be an eyesore in the middle of the gay village.
- The existing building is beautiful and enhances the neighbourhood with its presence. I don't object to residential units there per se, but demolishing the existing building would be a terrible waste, and subject the area to years of disruptive building work.

Other

- The building works will impact the village as road works will impede the location during the upcoming pride season.
- This is a historic and cultural venue in the heart of Manchester's gay village. The council should be ensuring the area retains its character and cultural significance. As such I would urge to reject the application and ensure the use of the property remain an LGBTQ venue.
- The noise report was conducted on Tuesday 25th - Wednesday 26th October 2023, Tuesday being the quietest night in the Gay Village. This does not reflect the dynamics of the adjacent businesses, why was the noise report not carried out on a Saturday night when Club Tropicana and adjacent bars and takeaways would be operating at their maximum capacity and in the early hours of the morning. We have designated smoking areas outside and customers queuing to enter the venue. We also have grave concerns that Club Tropicana was not included in the noise report.

Over the years it has become a mixed use area with residential properties and although local pubs comply with all of their licensing conditions it is common that when people move into residential properties in the area their expectations are quite different to the reality of a thriving nighttime tourist attraction that Manchester CC promotes. The plans show bedroom windows facing Sackville Street is their adequate sound proofing adopted and air conditioning with windows not being required to be opened to cope with the nature of the area, especially since you have not conducted noise tests at appropriate times for the area of the proposed construction and considering what has happened on Oldham Street with Night and Day.

We are objecting to this proposed construction in writing as we believe the noise report has been conducted insufficiently for the area. We believe the bedroom windows facing Sackville Street will become an issue for proposed residents and that may impact our business in the future if the planning is approved. The night time economy is a major source of income and employment for Manchester and was highly impacted during the pandemic, many businesses struggling to survive and some shutting their doors. Anything that may impact our business concerns us, a residential building almost adjacent to our business we feel inappropriate for that site.

Letters of Support:

- The vacant Vanilla nightclub which is rapidly becoming a derelict eyesore and a safe haven for a huge colony of rats which are plaguing the area and I support the principle of its redevelopment. I appreciate that the site is too small to be viable as an entertainment venue and understand that a new use needs to be found for such a prominent site within the village.

There is no point in trying to restore the existing building, as it has been completely stripped of any architectural features of merit and hollowed out inside. The latest design will fit in and suit the surrounding conservation area. The brick facing and new window and door designs are a great improvement on the previous plans. They very much are in sympathy with the beautiful, listed Albert Jones building 51-53 Richmond Street.

My only concern is the height of the proposed development. All other properties on both sides of this end of the street are three stories or less. The proposed height of the new building will overshadow and dominate adjacent residential properties making it even darker than it now is.

Numbers 40-52 are three stories with a roof terrace and small glass sunroom set to the rear of the roof. Such a similar use of the fourth floor would be more acceptable.

The property would then have the benefit of a period style coping which would be the highest thing to be seen from the street. This would be in sympathy with the coping on numbers 43-49 and the Victorian buildings on Whitworth Street.

- This will benefit our area and, as owner of an adjacent property, this will be beneficial for the street.

Ward Councillors – No comments received.

Head of Environmental Protection – Has no objections subject to conditions in relation to acoustic insulation and ventilation of the residential accommodation (including the need for an overheating assessment) acoustic insulation of plant, hours during which deliveries can take place and refuse storage and disposal being attached to any consent granted.

Head of Highways – Have sought clarification about the number of cycle parking spaces and type of storage proposed and have made comments about the public safety implications of an outward opening. Otherwise there are no objections subject to a construction management plan condition being attached to any consent granted.

GMEU – Have no objections subject to a conditions in relation to securing biodiversity enhancements.

Environment Agency – Have no comments as due to this being a minor development outside of Flood Risk Zone's 2 and 3/

Flood Risk Team – If approved we would have sought further clarification in relation to the proposed approach to SUDs Management.

GMAAS – Note that the building may retain elements of historic fabric deriving from its original intended use and warrants a basic record in advance of its ultimate loss. They advise that a historic building investigation of 39-41 Richmond Street is implemented to offset the loss of any historic fabric resulting from the proposed demolition, as recommended in the Heritage Statement submitted with the application.

Issues

Relevant National Policy

On 27th March 2012 the Department for Communities published the National Planning Policy Framework, which replaced planning policy statements and planning policy guidance notes, including PPS5 and PPG19.

The following sections of the National Planning Policy Framework are of relevance to this application:

Section 5 (Delivering a sufficient supply of homes) – The scheme would provide housing on a site where such accommodation is considered to be appropriate.

Section 6 - Building a strong and competitive economy states that Planning decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development (para 84). The proposals would create jobs during construction and new residents would support the local economy through the use of facilities and services.

Section 8 'Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities' states that planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places (para 96). The proposal would be safe and secure.

Section 9 'Promoting Sustainable Transport'- states that 'significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions and improve air quality and public health' (para 109).

In assessing applications for development, it should be ensured that: appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location; safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and, the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects national guidance including the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code; any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree (paragraph 114).

Developments should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe (paragraph 115).

Within this context, applications for development should: give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use; address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport; create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards; allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and, be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations (paragraph 116).

All developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed (paragraph 117).

The site is well connected to all public transport modes which would encourage sustainable and there would be on site cycle parking. There would be no unduly harmful impacts on the traffic network with physical and operational measures to promote non car travel. A Travel Plan could be secured as part of the conditions of any approval.

Section 11 'Making effective use of land' states that 'planning decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions' (paragraph 123).

Planning decisions should: encourage multiple benefits from urban land, including through mixed use schemes and taking opportunities to achieve net environmental gains – such as developments that would enable new habitat creation; recognise that some undeveloped land can perform many functions, such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, cooling/shading, carbon storage or food production; give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for identified needs, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land; promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively; and, support opportunities to use airspace above existing residential and commercial premises for new homes. (paragraph 124).

Local Planning Authorities should take a positive approach to applications for alternative uses of land which is currently developed but not allocated for a specified purpose in plans, where this would help to meet identified development needs. In particular they should support proposal to: use retail and employment land for homes in areas of high housing demand, provided this would not undermine key economic sectors or site or the vitality and viability of town centres, and would be compatible with other policies in the Framework; make more effective use of sites that provide community services such as schools and hospitals (paragraph 123).

Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account: the identified need for different types of housing and other forms of development, and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it; local market conditions and viability; the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services – both existing and proposed – as well as their potential for further improvement and the scope to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use; the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens), or of promoting regeneration and change; the important of securing well designed, attractive and healthy spaces (paragraph 127).

Whilst the housing would meet known regeneration requirements in the area the development would not maintain the area's prevailing character and setting.

The site is close to sustainable transport infrastructure. A travel plan would encourage the use public transport, walking and cycle routes to the site. This would be based on a car free development reducing car journeys to and from the site.

Section 12 'Achieving Well Designed Places' states that 'the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interest throughout the process' (paragraph 131).

Planning decisions should ensure that developments: will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities); establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit; optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public spaces) and support local facilities and transport networks; and create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience (paragraph 135).

Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments and can also help to mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning decisions should ensure that new streets are tree lined, that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments, that appropriate measures are in place to ensure the long term maintenance of newly placed trees and that existing trees are retained wherever possible (paragraph 136).

Development that is not well designed should be refused, specifically where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design. Conversely, significant weight should be given to: development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or outstanding or innovative design which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings (paragraph 139).

The proposed building, due to the overall distribution of its massing, façade design and the use of materials to articulate the facades would not achieve a well-designed place. It would not be visually attractive or sympathetic to local character and history, nor would it establish or maintain a strong sense of place. It would not be high quality or complement the distinctive architecture within the area. There are also areas of the design that are not properly detailed within the submission in relation to acoustic insulation and ventilation and prevention of overheating which have implications for the overall design. The potential of the site could be optimised through other more appropriate forms of development whilst delivering the same level of other benefits as required by this Section of the NPPF. These issues are discussed in detail later in this Report.

Section 14 'Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change' states that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure (para 157).

The proposed demolition would be contrary to the recommendations of paragraph 157 of the NPPF, which requires the planning system to support the transition to a low carbon future through the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings.

New development should be planned for in ways that: avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change. When new development is brought forward in areas

which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, including through the planning of green infrastructure; and can help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as through its location orientation and design. Any local requirements for the sustainability of buildings should reflect the Government's policy for national technical standards (paragraph 159).

In determining planning applications, Local Planning Authorities should expect new development to: comply with any development plan policies on local requirements of decentralised energy supply unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant, having regard to the type of development involved and its design, that this is not feasible or viable; and take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy consumption (paragraph 162).

The buildings fabric would be highly efficient, and it be based on the use electricity. Efficient drainage systems would manage water at the site.

Section 15 'Conserving and Enhancing the natural environment' states that planning decision should contribute and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting valued landscapes, minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, preventing new and existing development from contributing to unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability and remediating contaminated land. High performing fabric would ensure no unduly harmful noise outbreak on the local area. Recommendations are made within an Ecology Assessment about biodiversity enhancements.

Paragraph 189 outlines that planning decisions should ensure that a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from contamination. There is contamination at the site from its former uses. The ground conditions are not usual or complex and can be appropriate remediated.

Paragraph 191 outlines that decisions should ensure that the development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects of pollution in health, living conditions and the natural environment. There would be some short term noise impacts associated with construction, but these can be managed to avoid any unduly harmful impacts on amenity. There are no noise or lighting implications associated with the operation of the development.

Paragraph 192 states that decisions should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones. Opportunities to improve air quality or mitigate impacts should be identified, such as through traffic and travel management, and green infrastructure provision and enhancement.

Paragraph 193 states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development can be integrated effectively with existing businesses and community facilities (such as places of worship, pubs, music venues and sports clubs). Existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. Where the operation of an existing business or community facility could have a significant adverse effect on new development (including changes of use) in its vicinity, the applicant (or 'agent of change') should be required to provide suitable mitigation before the development has been completed.

The proposal would not worsen local air quality conditions. If the development does not have adequate levels of acoustic insulation and ventilation which also deals with potential for overheating, then there could be conflicts with adjacent entertainment venues. It is considered

that inadequate information has been provided with the application to demonstrate that this would not be an issue. This is discussed in detail later in this Report.

The proposal would not worsen local air quality conditions and suitable mitigation can be put in place during construction. A travel plan and access to public transport encouraging alternative travel choices. The site is within Zone 1 of the Environment Agency flood maps and has a low probability of flooding.

Section 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment – which states that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

And that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.

In terms of the NPPF the following should also be noted:

Paragraph 195 – Requires that heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

Paragraph 200 - Local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.

Paragraph 201 - LPAs should ensure that any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal is avoided or minimised.

Paragraph 202 - Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state should not be taken into account in any decision.

Paragraph 203 - In determining applications, LPA's should take account of, the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets.

Paragraph 205 - When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Paragraph 206 - Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.

Paragraph 207 - Proposals that lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset should be refused, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm

is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.

Paragraph 208 - Proposals of less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should be weighed against the wider public benefits of the proposal.

Paragraph 209 - The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application.

Paragraph 212 - Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance.

Paragraph 213 - Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 207 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 208, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole.

The proposals would be contrary to paragraphs 195, 201, 203, 205, 206, 208, 209, 212 and 213. The reasons for this are discussed in more detail below.

Paragraphs 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of the NPPF outline a “presumption in favour of sustainable development”. This means approving development, without delay, where it accords with the development plan and where the development is absent or relevant policies are out-of-date, to grant planning permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF.

Planning Policy Guidance (PPG)- The relevant sections of the PPG are as follows:

Air Quality provides guidance on how this should be considered for new developments. Paragraph 8 states that mitigation options where necessary will be locationally specific, will depend on the proposed development and should be proportionate to the likely impact. It is important therefore that local planning authorities work with applicants to consider appropriate mitigation so as to ensure the new development is appropriate for its location and unacceptable risks are prevented. Planning conditions and obligations can be used to secure mitigation where the relevant tests are met.

Examples of mitigation include:

- the design and layout of development to increase separation distances from sources of air pollution;
- using green infrastructure, in particular trees, to absorb dust and other pollutants; • means of ventilation;
- promoting infrastructure to promote modes of transport with low impact on air quality; controlling dust and emissions from construction, operation and demolition; and
- contributing funding to measures, including those identified in air quality action plans and low emission strategies, designed to offset the impact on air quality arising from new development.

Noise states that Local planning authorities’ should take account of the acoustic environment and in doing so consider:

- whether or not a significant adverse effect is occurring or likely to occur;
- whether or not an adverse effect is occurring or likely to occur; and

- whether or not a good standard of amenity can be achieved.

Mitigating the noise impacts of a development will depend on the type of development being considered and the character of the proposed location. In general, for noise making developments, there are four broad types of mitigation:

- engineering: reducing the noise generated at source and/or containing the noise generated;
- layout: where possible, optimising the distance between the source and noise sensitive receptors and/or incorporating good design to minimise noise transmission through the use of screening by natural or purpose built barriers, or other buildings;
- using planning conditions/obligations to restrict activities allowed on the site at certain times and/or specifying permissible noise levels differentiating as appropriate between different times of day, such as evenings and late at night, and;
- mitigating the impact on areas likely to be affected by noise including through noise insulation when the impact is on a building.

Design states that where appropriate the following should be considered:

- layout – the way in which buildings and spaces relate to each other
- form – the shape of buildings
- scale – the size of buildings
- detailing – the important smaller elements of building and spaces
- materials – what a building is made from

Health and well being states opportunities for healthy lifestyles have been considered (e.g. planning for an environment that supports people of all ages in making healthy choices, helps to promote active travel and physical activity, and promotes access to healthier food, high quality open spaces and opportunities for play, sport and recreation);

Travel Plans, Transport Assessments in decision taking states that applications can positively contribute to:

- encouraging sustainable travel;
- lessening traffic generation and its detrimental impacts;
- reducing carbon emissions and climate impacts;
- creating accessible, connected, inclusive communities;
- improving health outcomes and quality of life;
- improving road safety; and
- reducing the need for new development to increase existing road capacity or provide new roads.

Heritage states that public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental objectives as described in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 8). Public benefits should flow from the Proposed Development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits, for example, works to a listed private dwelling which secure its future as a designated heritage asset could be a public benefit.”

Public benefits may also include heritage benefits, such as:

- Sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting;
- Reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset;
- Securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long-term conservation.

The National Design Guide (January 2021) - This illustrates how well-designed places that are beautiful, enduring and successful can be achieved in practice. It forms part of the Government's collection of planning practice guidance and should be read alongside the separate planning practice guidance on design process and tools.

There are 10 characteristics of well-designed places within the National Design Guide which are listed below:

- Context – enhances the surroundings
- Identity – attractive and distinctive
- Built form – a coherent pattern of development
- Movement – accessible and easy to move around
- Nature – enhanced and optimised
- Public Spaces – safe, social and inclusive
- Uses – mixed and integrated
- Homes and buildings – functional, healthy and sustainable
- Resources – efficient and resilient
- Lifespan – made to last

The proposed form of development would not enhance its surroundings to an acceptable level. Its distinctiveness would not be expressed in an attractive manner, and it would not deliver a coherent development that properly responds to context.

Other National Planning Legislation

Legislative requirements

Section 66 of the Listed Building Act 1990 provides that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development that affects a listed building or its setting the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

S72 of the Listed Building Act 1990 provides that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development that affects the setting or character of a conservation area the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

S17 Crime and Disorder Act 1998 provides that in the exercise of its planning functions the Council shall have regard to the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder

Core Strategy - The following policies are considered to be most relevant to the proposed development:

Policy SP 1 (Spatial Principles) – The development would remove a sense of dereliction and improve street activity and natural surveillance. However, it would not create a well designed

place or create a high quality neighbourhood for residents and would not enhance the built environment.

Policy CC3 Housing – It is expected that a minimum of 16,500 new homes will be provided in the City Centre up to 2027. The development would be located within an area identified for residential development and would suit a range of occupants.

Policy CC1 (Primary Economic Development Focus: City Centre and Fringe) –which identifies that City Centre as a strategic economic location and focus of employment growth encouraging a variety of high quality accommodation types, sizes and foot-plates to boost investment by local, national and international businesses and supports the provision of a range of economic development uses, such as retail, leisure, entertainment, cultural and tourism facilities within the City Centre to support the development of a vibrant employment location attractive to businesses, employees and visitors to the City Centre. The proposed use would align with this policy.

Policy EC1 (Land for Employment and Economic Development) – The proposal would develop a highly accessible site in a key location for employment growth. It would provide jobs for local people, through construction and use (commercial and building management). It would connect residents with local jobs as the site is close to transport infrastructure and would encourage walking, cycling and public transport use. It would support the continued social, economic and environmental regeneration of the city.

Policy CC5 (Transport) - The proposal would be accessible by a variety of modes of sustainable transport and would help to improve air quality.

Policy CC8 (Change and Renewal) – Jobs would be created during construction but the development would not improve the character and function of the City Centre, taking other Core Strategy policies into account. It would have an adverse impact on the City's heritage and character.

Policy CC9 (Design and Heritage) – This would not preserve or enhance the heritage assets and its appearance would not be of the highest standard. The reasons for this are set out in detail below.

Policy CC10 (A Place for Everyone) – A high quality residential led mixed use development would appeal to a wide range of residents.

Policy H1 Overall Housing Provision – This City Centre site is considered appropriate for residential development.

Policy H8 Affordable Housing – The development is below the threshold for the provision of affordable housing.

Policy T1 (Sustainable Transport) – The proposal would encourage modal shift from car travel to more sustainable alternatives.

Policy T2 (Accessible Areas of Opportunity and Need) – The proposal would be accessible by a variety of sustainable transport modes and would help to connect people to jobs, local facilities and public spaces.

Policy EN1 (Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas) - The design would not enhance the character of the area and the image of Manchester. It would not enhance legibility. This is discussed in more detail below.

Policy EN3 Heritage – It is considered that the building would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of Whitworth Street Conservation Area and the settings of the nearby listed buildings. This is discussed in more detail below.

Policy EN4 Reducing CO2 Emissions by Enabling Low and Zero Carbon Development - The proposal would follow the principle of the Energy Hierarchy to reduce CO2 emissions.

Policy EN6 Target Framework for CO2 reductions from low or zero carbon energy supplies – The development would comply with the CO2 emission reduction targets set out in this policy.

Policy EN 8 Adaptation to Climate Change - The energy statement sets out how the building has been designed to consider adaptability in relation to climate change. The application is not supported by an Overheating Assessment (as requested by the Head of Regulatory and Enforcement Services) in order to illustrate the level of plant and consequent noise generation implications that would be required to comply with current Building Regulation requirements.

Policy EN15 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) – The site is not high quality in ecology terms and biodiversity enhancements are proposed.

Policy EN16 (Air Quality) - The proposal would be highly accessible by all forms of public transport and reduce reliance on cars and minimise traffic emissions. The proposal would not compromise air quality. The proposal would not be reliant on cars which would minimise emissions generated by the development. Cycling is encouraged although there would be less than 1 space per apartment. Dust suppressions measures will be used during construction.

Policy EN17 (Water Quality) – An assessment of ground and groundwater conditions shows the proposal would be unlikely to cause contamination to surface watercourses and the impact on water quality can be controlled by a condition.

Policy EN18 (Contaminated Land and Ground Stability) - A desk study identifies possible risks from ground contamination which could be controlled through a condition.

Policy EN19 (Waste) - The development would be consistent with the principles of waste hierarchy. Details of how waste storage and collection have been submitted and these could be controlled through a condition.

Policy DM 1 Development Management – This policy sets out the requirements for developments and outlines a range of general issues that all development should have regard to. Of these the following issues are or relevance to this proposal:

- appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials and detail;
- design for health;
- adequacy of internal accommodation and amenity space.
- impact on the surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development;
- that development should have regard to the character of the surrounding area;
- effects on amenity, including privacy, light, noise, vibration, air quality and road safety and traffic generation;
- accessibility to buildings, neighbourhoods and sustainable transport modes;
- impact on safety, crime prevention and health; adequacy of internal accommodation external amenity space, refuse storage and collection, vehicular access and car parking; and

- impact on biodiversity, landscape, archaeological or built heritage, green Infrastructure and flood risk and drainage.

The application is considered in detail in relation to the above issues within the Issues section below.

The Unitary Development Plan for Manchester – Whilst the Core Strategy has now been adopted some of the UDP policies remain saved as there are no replacement policies contained in the Core Strategy. The relevant policies are detailed below:

DC18.1 (Conservation Areas) - which seeks to preserve and enhance the character of its designated conservation areas. – the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Whitworth Street Conservation Area, and this is discussed in detail below.

DC19.1 (Listed Buildings) - which seeks to preserve and enhance the settings of listed buildings by appropriate control over new developments within their vicinity. the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the settings of nearby listed buildings. This is discussed in detail below.

Places for Everyone (PfE) - The Inspectors' Report on the examination of the Places for Everyone plan was published on 15 February 2024. The Inspectors' Report sets out and justifies their recommendations in relation to the plan, and they have concluded that all legal requirements have been met and that with the recommended main modifications set out in the appendix to their report, the Places for Everyone plan is 'sound'.

The nine constituent local authorities will now consider the Inspectors' Report and the adoption of Places for Everyone, with the plan going to the Full Council meeting in Manchester on 20 March 2024. The first Council meetings to approve the plan will be Salford and Wigan (28 February).

There will be a period of six-week post adoption (i.e. from 21 March) when a judicial review challenge may be made. This will trigger a process of consideration by the Courts as to whether a JR is sufficient grounds to be heard (there is a one-step oral hearing appeal process if a Judge decides to reject the ground for a JR from the outset).

Given the stage the Plan has reached, the Plan and its policies is now a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications. The Plan and its policies must therefore be given significant weight in the planning balance

Policy JP-Strat1: Core Growth Area- Housing on this site would support economic growth. Jobs would be created during construction. However for reasons outlined below these benefits would not outweigh the harm to the heritage assets.

Policy JP- Strat2: City Centre- This would be housing scheme in a highly sustainable location. The biodiversity would be improved. However for reasons outlined below these benefits would not outweigh the harm to the heritage assets.

Policy JP-S2: Carbon and Energy – The proposal would exceed the requirements under Part L 2021.

Policy JP-S5: Flood Risk and the Water Environment – The development would have an integrated drainage scheme that would minimise surface water run off.

Policy JP-S6: Clean Air –Construction activities can be mitigated to minimise the impact on local air quality.

Policy JP-S7: Resource Efficiency – Resources would be consumed during construction and demolition. On site demolition is limited. The proposal would be highly efficient and low carbon.

Policy JP-H3: Type, Size and Design of New Housing – The proposal would include 4 units all of which would exceed the space standards set out with the Manchester Residential Design Guidance.

Policy JP-H4: Density of New Housing – This would be a high density development in a sustainable area.

Policy JP-P1 – Sustainable Places – The proposals would remove the current clear understanding of how the place has developed and would not respects and acknowledge the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used

Policy JP-P 2 (Heritage) The development proposals would have an adverse impact on the overall character of the conservation area and setting of listed building and would result in the loss of a non designated heritage asset undermine the significance of the conservation area and the setting of adjacent listed buildings. The harm is not justified and outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal.

Manchester Residential Quality Guidance (July 2016) (MRQG) – The City Council has endorsed the Manchester Residential Quality Guidance which is now a material planning consideration. The document provides specific guidance for Manchester and includes a section on the consideration of space and daylight. The guide states that space standards within dwellings should comply with the National Described Space Standards as a minimum. In assessing space standards for a particular development, consideration needs to be given to the planning and laying out of the home and the manner in which its design creates distinct and adequate spaces for living, sleeping, kitchens, bathrooms and storage. The size of rooms should be sufficient to allow users adequate space to move around comfortably, anticipating and accommodating changing needs and circumstances. It also recommends that one cycle parking space is provided for each apartment.

The Guidance seeks to promote excellent design standards in developments within the City in order to secure high quality well designed residential developments. It acknowledges that local distinctiveness and character cannot be enhanced through delivery of a one size fits all approach to placemaking.

Of particular relevance to the evaluation of this application the following sections of the Guidance are noted:

- New development should investigate and reference its historical context; interpreting.
- Materials, styles and detailing in a contemporary context can reinforce local distinctiveness and a sense of place. Residential design should create new housing that responds to the existing urban fabric, building typologies and the city's distinctive style while also embracing modern materials and contemporary ideas.

- Make it Animate Street and Spaces -The interrelationship between buildings, streets and spaces in making a place feel safe and inviting.
- Good design does not simply restore and retain existing character; it also amplifies and transforms it.
- With the exception of areas of existing special character (or those with a strong sense of place, such as conservation areas) an increase in density should be encouraged in those parts of the city that are well connected to public transport and have greater access to public services, community facilities, amenity and recreation provision.
- Respectful design can also contrast with historical buildings, amplifying both old and new. This needs to work at all scales: from heritage that forms a distinctive neighbourhood identity, through to the finer nuances of architectural detailing that reference the history of a particular site.
- Residential development should respond to its context. This may mean continuing a particular approach and materials palette; it may mean introducing something different that can act as a counterpoint to the existing character. In either case, the choice of materials should be clarified with the Council. Variation of materials, when used carefully and sparingly, can enhance character and increase legibility through creating something memorable. The way materials are combined, and the number of materials used and how they are applied, is a key consideration. Materiality should also consider a range of scales. Materials used within a single building must work together, but should also fit within the context of the wider street, block and neighbourhood.

New development will be expected to comply with the Guidance. However, where a proposal does not, the only justification for exception will be on the grounds that the proposed scheme produces exemplary and innovative design and / or the scheme delivers significant over-riding public benefits.

In terms of the wider quality aspirations within the Guidance it is considered that the proposed development would meet the key design aspirations relating to thresholds, space and daylight, storage, privacy, practical considerations (waste) sustainability (including access to sustainable transport options), creation of mixed communities and futureproofing. However, it is considered that there would be non compliance with a number of embedded design criteria which is not justified by exemplary and innovative design and / or the scheme delivering significant over-riding public benefits. This non compliance is discussed in more detail later in this report but can be summarised in the context of the above points from the Guidance as follows:

- The design would be pastiche and the materials, styles and detailing would not reinforce local distinctiveness and a sense of place.
- Restoration and retention of existing character would not amplify or transforms through good design.
- Whilst in a part of the city that is well connected to public transport, has greater access to public services, community facilities, amenity and recreation

provision, the site lies within a conservation area and affects listed buildings, and these factors need to be afforded weight commensurate with their significance and the impacts on their special character.

- The proposed design is not respectful in terms of either contrast with historical buildings or amplifying both old and new.
- The proposed massing is not appropriate to context, based on an understanding of the site and its context or the city's desire to see sound place making.
- Whilst the use of brick would be contextually appropriate in this location, the variation of materials, would not enhance character and increase legibility through creating something memorable.

The above non-compliance within the context of the above and that are discussed in more detail later in this report.

Conservation Area Declaration

Whitworth Street Conservation Area Declaration : The Whitworth Street Conservation Area has been designated as a Conservation Area as it lies at the heart of Manchester's business and commercial district and to preserve and enhance the impressive grandeur of this part of the City historically associated with major banking, insurance and other financial institutions for the North of England. The area today is remarkable for buildings which whilst of a variety of architectural styles stand well together. The area was designated in November 1970 and extended in June 1986. The Whitworth Street/Princess Street Conservation Area was designated in 1974 (extended in 1985). Its physical form is established by the wealth of Victorian and Edwardian buildings erected between 1850 and 1920. They reflect the historical importance of the textile industry in the city and provide the most distinctive element in the Conservation Area streetscape. The buildings vary in size and range from six to seven storeys and are characterised by having rich and deeply modelled front facades in brick and/or terracotta, whilst the rear was almost entirely glazed either in a vertical plane or a stepped configuration. Although the area is no longer connected with the industry, the architectural building style associated with textile industry remains largely intact in the area should be noted that the area does contain many substantial buildings, such as the Former Refuge Assurance Offices (Palace Hotel), UMIST, India House, Asia House and Lancaster House. The height of the warehouses give the area it's most obvious physical character of a 'canyon' like atmosphere. These buildings all have large floor plates and contain substantial amounts of floorspace and are indicative of substantial buildings have been a characteristic of this area for many years.

Principle of the Use / Regeneration

Manchester is the fastest growing city in the UK, with the city centre population increasing from a few thousand in the late 1990s to circa 24,000 by 2011. The population is expected to increase considerably by 2030, and this, together with trends and changes in household formation, requires additional housing. This proposal would contribute to this need. Providing the right quality and diversity of housing including affordable homes, is critical to economic growth and regeneration to attract and retain a talented workforce and critical to increasing population to maintain the City's growth. These homes would be in a well-connected location, adjacent to major employment and areas earmarked for future employment growth.

Regeneration is an important planning consideration as it is the primary economic driver of the region and crucial to its longer term economic success. There has been a significant amount of regeneration around the site over the past 30 years through private and public sector investment. Major change has occurred at Kampus and around Piccadilly Station.

Whilst the building is currently vacant it is clearly capable of using for a bar / club as evidenced by its previous use and there are a number of other potential uses such as offices, residential conversion or a café / restaurant use that it could be put to and no evidence has been provided to support that any demolition is justified by the inability for the building to be used for purposes that would support the ongoing regeneration of the City Centre. The right form of development which would not be wholesale demolition would make a significant contribution to the ongoing regeneration of the area. Any development must be of a quality consistent with the recent developments which form the wider site context as detailed elsewhere in this report.

Notwithstanding the principle of the demolition the form of development proposed would not be of an appropriate quality and would not enhance its surroundings to an acceptable level and it would not deliver a coherent development that properly responds to context or which maintains the area's prevailing character and setting.

The massing, façade design and the materials proposed to articulate the facades would not achieve a well-designed place. It would not be visually attractive or sympathetic to local character and history, nor would it establish or maintain a strong sense of place. It would not be high quality or complement the areas distinctive architecture. The potential of the site could be optimised through more appropriate forms of development with the same level or enhanced benefits.

The development would be close to major transport hubs and would promote sustainable economic growth.

The proposal may use the site efficiently and effectively as required by paras 123 of the NPPF but this would be predicated on a demolition of an underused building which would not be supported by para 124(d). When taking into account factors set out above and, but the scale, massing and design is not acceptable in its context such that it is not well designed as required by paragraphs 128 and 135 of the NPPF. In particular the proposal would not maintain the area's prevailing character and setting, would not be an appropriate scheme to promote regeneration and change nor would it be well designed and attractive. It is considered that other forms of development which would develop the site at a similar density could be consistent with paragraphs 124 and 135 of the NPPF.

Whilst the housing would meet known regeneration requirements in the area the demolition and redevelopment would not maintain the area's prevailing character and setting

Affordable housing provision – The number of units proposed falls below the 15 or more units level that requires a contribution to be made to the City-wide target for 20% of new housing provision to be affordable.

Residential development - density/type/accommodation standards - The proposed development would comply with the spaces standards as set out in the Residential Quality Guidance and National Space Standards. The Residential Quality Guidance highlights the importance of providing homes which meet a range of needs including city centre family living. The apartments would be suitable for a range of users.

Consideration of the merits of the proposals within the National and Local Policy Context relating to Heritage Assets and Design Issues

There are 2 key issues to consider here, firstly, if the principle and justification for the demolition of the existing building can be supported and secondly if the proposed design of the replacement building is acceptable. The design and loss of the NDHA has been considered and assessed in relation to context and its effect on the character of the Whitworth Street Conservation Area and the setting of the adjacent listed buildings at 27 Sackville Street the former warehouses at 51-53 and 58 Richmond Street and 33 Sackville Street.

In terms of the design the key issues are the appropriateness of the scale and massing, appropriateness of the external form and design in terms of materials and detailing both in relation to overall design quality and its relationship to other structures in its context.

Principle of Demolition

This area of Manchester was developed in the late 18th century, with residential terraces laid out in a gridiron pattern, largely replaced by industrial and other buildings during the 19th and early 20th century as the city prospered from the textile industry. Dated to c.1800 the premises are a rare survivor of Georgian residential development in the area, constructed as a pair of terraced residences prior to the area's urbanization and industrialization in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Its form, construction, appearance and footprint are reflective of its date and origin, contributing to its appreciation as c.1800 dwelling.

The submitted Heritage Statement considers that the premises under consideration are of low value but Officers do not concur with this view. It is noted that despite modern alterations and erosion of architectural interest, the asset is a rare local survival of a c.1800 residential terrace, appreciated and legible as such. It makes an important contribution to the sense of place, sense of history and overall special significance of the Whitworth Conservation Area. Considering its age, form, layout, appearance and location, Officers consider that the building is a NDHA (a view which the applicants concur with in the submitted Heritage Statement) and consequently the heritage significance of the building is considered to merit special consideration in the planning decisions.

On account of its high historic interest and rarity, the building is considered a non-designated heritage asset and an important contributor to the sense of place, sense of history and overall special significance of the Whitworth Conservation Area.

The proposed demolition of 39-41 Richmond Street would cause less than substantial but nonetheless considerable harm to the Whitworth Conservation Area. It would remove a rare example of an early domestic development in the area, eroding its appreciation, sense of history and historic significance. This view is consistent with paragraph 213 of the NPPF which notes that a loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 207 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 208, as appropriate.

In demolishing the whole Georgian terrace, the development would also fail to take advantage of the distinct historic and heritage features of the City Centre and fail to preserve or enhance its historic environment, as per Policy EN3 of the Core Strategy.

In demolishing the whole Georgian terrace, the development would also fail to take advantage of the distinct historic and heritage feature of the City Centre and fail to preserve or enhance its historic environment, as per Policy EN3 of the Core Strategy.

The demolition, which will have an adverse impact on the designated conservation area, has not been substantiated with clear and convincing justification, as required by paragraph 206 of

the NPPF.

No alternative options other than demolition have been considered and assessed as part of the application and it has not been demonstrated that the building is incapable of a viable re-use consistent with its conservation. The site can, and should, be improved or enhanced through a development of appropriate quality and in the absence of evidence to the contrary this should be a sensitive reuse of the building and could include some level of sensitive alteration to facilitate the buildings re-use. This should preserve or enhance the special qualities of the historic environment and local amenity, and improve the appearance of the city centre, meeting the aspirations of regeneration objectives. The current proposal would not deliver this.

The proposed demolition would also be contrary to paragraph 157 of the NPPF, which requires the planning system to support the transition to a low carbon future through the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings.

Without evidence to the contrary within the submission it is not possible to conclude that the building is not capable of re-use. Proposals which would retain, re-use and improve the premises, would support the preservation and enhancement of the conservation area and setting of adjacent listed buildings meeting the objectives of Section 16 of the NPPF (paragraphs 195, 201, 203, 205, 206, 208, 209, 212 and 213) Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Core Strategy Policy EN3.

Design

Notwithstanding the above should the principle of the demolition have been accepted it is considered that the proposed height of the building would be appropriate to its immediate and wider context.

It is considered that whilst the design and appearance of the scheme attempt to contextualise the proposed new development, notwithstanding this it is considered that the massing and design would be a pastiche and not compliant with Policies EN1 and CC9 of the Core Strategy, PpE policies JP-P1 and JP-P2, guidance within Section 12 of the NPPF and Manchester Residential Quality Guidance (2017).

The proposed massing with the mansard roof, due to its proportions, materials and finishes, appears detached from the rest of the external envelope. The dormers – varied in form, mass and design – would create a haphazard arrangement that would fail to result in a considered and cohesive ‘top’ to the building and have an overall poor relation to the mansard roof itself. The misalignment of the dormers with the windows below to the rear elevation and north corner would accentuate this further detaching the top storey from the rest of the building.

The proposed details and architectural features would not relate well to each other and would fail to present a well-integrated and well through-out new scheme. For example, the door frames to front and rear appear to be stuck-on rather than meaningfully integrated into the building, standard doors would contrast starkly with these ornate features. The single turret to north corner and the varying tops to dormers would appear arbitrary. The squat window to the side (north-east) and the two narrow windows set into square frames to the rear are poorly-portioned.

Overall, the detailing is not considered to be high-quality or well-considered, but rather lacks coherence and discipline which would be incompatible historic context of the site.

No additional information on the proposed materials, finishes and quality of the new

development have been submitted as part of the application, failing to evidence its quality and permanence. Consequently, the application fails to evidence compliance with Policy JP-P1 and DM1 and the guidance within paragraphs 135 and 140 of the NPPF.

Conclusion

Due to the level of proposed demolition and the massing and design of the proposal, which are not considered acceptable on heritage and urban design grounds, the proposal would neither preserve nor enhance the Whitworth Street Conservation Area, or the setting of the Grade II listed 27 Sackville Street, the former warehouses at 51-53 and 58 Richmond Street and 33 Sackville Street. It would fail to preserve or enhance the local distinctiveness and inherent character of the Conservation Area. It is also considered that a clear and convincing justification for the level of harm as required by paragraph 206 of the NPPF has not been given.

Development decisions should also accord with the requirements of Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework which notes that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and emphasises that they should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Of particular relevance to the consideration of this application are paragraph's (paragraphs 195, 203, 205, 206, 208, 209, 210, 212 and 213).

The NPPF (paragraph 205) stresses that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets, irrespective of the level of harm. Significance of an asset can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction or by development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should clearly and convincingly justified.

Officers view is that that regeneration could be delivered through a scheme that gives greater weight to the rich architectural heritage and character of the Whitworth Street Conservation Area, including the special interest of the Grade II listed 27 Sackville Street the former warehouses at 51-53 and 58 Richmond Street and 33 Sackville Street and the non-designated 39-41 Richmond Street, principally this could be achieved through reuse and potentially sensitive alterations to the existing building on the site.

The overall impact on the historic environment would be adverse, within the upper scale of the less than substantial harm. The development would erode the special interest of the Whitworth Street Conservation Area, Grade II listed 27 Sackville Street the former warehouses at 51-53 and 58 Richmond Street and 33 Sackville Street and the non-designated 39-41 Richmond Street.

By reasons of the proposed detail, form and appearance, and requiring the demolition of a c.1800 Georgian terrace, as part of the balanced view required by paragraph 209 of the NPPF, it is not agreed that the proposed scheme would make a positive contribution to the heritage significance, sense of history and special character of the conservation area.

On the contrary, the new development would not be of an acceptable standard in terms of appearance and function, would erode the qualities that make the conservation area special and fail to protect its special character and sense of place, and it would not enhance or better reveal the significance of the Whitworth Street Conservation Area. The proposals would thus

failing to comply with Policies EN3, CC9, DM1, JP-P1 and JP-Strat2 and paragraph 212 of the NPPF.

Under Paragraph 213 of the NPPF the loss of a building that makes a positive contribution to the significance of a conservation area (as is the case with the current building on the site as described above) should be treated as less than substantial harm. Paragraph 208 of the NPPF states that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm, it should be weighed against the public benefits including securing its optimum viable use. Paragraph 20 of the NPPF Planning Practice Guidance states that public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 7). Public benefits may include heritage benefits.

The public benefits arising from the development, would include:-

- Accommodating additional residents;
- Promoting active travel, including walking and cycling. A cycle store would be located on the ground floor of the development to allow residents to securely store their bikes in a convenient location;
- Being located in a highly sustainable location it would be well-connected by public transport to the wider urban area and includes no car parking spaces;

However, the benefits would not outweigh the high level of harm to designated and non-designated heritage assets. These benefits could be delivered by alternative forms of development which would have less harm and no convincing case has been made for the proposed demolition that demonstrates that the proposals are the optimum viable use of the site.

For reasons set out in this report it is not considered that the proposal would be consistent with sections 66 and 72 of the Planning Act in relation to preservation and enhancement. Paragraph 212 of the NPPF states that Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. It states that proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably. This is not the case for the proposal. The demolition and massing, colour, form and materials for the replacement building would not relate positively to existing adjacent high-quality buildings and complement their character. It would not enhance the sense of place and would not acknowledge the characteristics of massing, proportions, elevational subdivision of adjacent buildings.

Regeneration could be better delivered through a scheme that gives greater weight to the rich architectural heritage and character of the Whitworth Street Conservation Area, including the special interest of the Grade II listed 27 Sackville Street the former warehouses at 51-53 and 58 Richmond Street and 33 Sackville Street and the non-designated 39-41 Richmond Street.

Sunlight and Daylight Impacts

The nature of high density City Centre development means that amenity issues, such as daylight, sunlight and the proximity of buildings to one another have to be dealt with in a manner appropriate to their context.

An assessment of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing has used specialist software to measure the amount of daylight and sunlight available to windows in neighbouring buildings. The assessment made reference to the BRE Guide to Good Practice – Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight Second Edition BRE Guide (2012).

This assessment is not mandatory but is generally accepted as industry standard and helps local planning authorities consider these impacts. The guidance does not have 'set' targets and is intended to be interpreted flexibly, acknowledging that locational circumstances need to be taken into account, such as a site being within a town or city centre where higher density development is expected and obstruction of light to buildings can be inevitable.

The BRE Guidelines suggest that homes have the highest requirement for daylight and sunlight and states that they are intended for rooms where natural light is required, including living rooms, kitchens and bedrooms.

The Ville Hotel at 42 Canal Street and some homes at 40-52 Richmond Street are identified as being affected in terms of daylight and sunlight. Other relevant properties have been scoped out due to their distance and orientation from the site.

The Sunlight and Daylight Assessment has set out the current site condition VSC levels and how the proposal would perform against the BRE VSC targets.

BRE Targets

The Guidance states that a reduction of VSC to a window of more than 20% or of NSL by 20% does not necessarily mean that the room would be left inadequately lit, but there is a greater chance that the reduction in daylight would be more apparent. Under the Guidance, a scheme would comply, if figures achieved are within 0.8 times of baseline figures. Similarly, winter targets of APSH of 4% and an annual APSH of 20% are considered to be acceptable levels of tolerance. For the purposes of the sensitivity analysis, these values are a measure against which a noticeable reduction in daylight and sunlight would be discernible and are referred to as the BRE Alternative Target. (BRE Target within the Environmental Statement). The impacts of the development in this context are set out below.

Alternative targets

The BRE guidance document recognises that the numerical values provided are not always appropriate different targets may be used based on special requirements of the proposed development or its location. There are a number of examples provided where deviations of the numeral values are appropriate and suggestions to determine alternatives are described. One of these examples relates to cases where an existing building has windows that are unusually close to the site boundary and taking more than their fair share of light. In these cases, it is suggested that a target is set by using a "mirror-image" of the building of the same height and size, an equal distance away on the other side of the boundary. Another example relates to new buildings in densely built-up inner city areas such as mews. In these instances the guidelines suggest that a VSC that is typical for these mews should be used to set the benchmark. This approach has been adopted in the submitted assessment using a mirror images for the recently constructed 40-52 Richmond Street.

Daylight Impacts

Four windows to bedroom in the hotel are affected: two of these (W1 and W2) only suffer a minor (between 0.70 and 0.80) negative affect. Both the bedroom and the living room to 40

Richmond Street (W11 and W12) would not meet the BRE Target, although the effect is only minor (between 0.70 and 0.80).

For the alternative target with the exception of Window 5 (which is a window to the hotel) all windows would meet the BRE Target.

Sunlight Impacts

All of the relevant windows for this analysis would meet the BRE Target.

It is considered that the above impacts are acceptable in a City Centre context.

Car Parking, cycle parking and relationship to public transport infrastructure

The site is highly accessibility via public transport including Metrolink, Metroshuttle, mainline rail and bus and the on-going public transport improvements within the City Centre would further enhance accessibility. One cycle parking space per unit will be provided.

Energy Efficiency and Sustainability - New developments should attain high standards of sustainability because of their high profile and local impact. The Code for Sustainable Homes was revoked in March 2015 but it is important to understand how a development performs in respect of waste efficiency and energy standards.

Notwithstanding this the proposal is supported by an Energy Standards Statement which outlines an overall commitment to reducing energy consumption under occupancy through the adoption of a Fabric First principle which will seek enhanced insulation standards and improved heating and lighting efficiencies in comparison to the standard requirements of Approved Document Part L 2021. Further carbon emission reduction would be achieved by using renewables (Air source Heatpumps). By incorporating the measures outlined in the Statement the proposed development would achieve an average carbon emission reduction of 75.6%.

The proposal would deliver a scheme that is efficient and cost effective during occupation.

Air Quality

The site is located within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), which covers the whole of the City Centre, which could potentially exceed the annual nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) air quality objective. Whilst an Air Quality Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application this contains some inaccuracies and the data used is not up to date. Notwithstanding this the development would be located in the City Centre and has access to all forms of public transport including tram, bus and rail and it is considered that the scheme would be unlikely to significantly affect air quality for future residents of the development subject to inclusion of mechanical ventilation and filtration which would be secured via a condition attached to any consent granted.

Good on site practices would ensure dust and air quality impacts are not significant and should remain in place during the construction period and should be a condition.

Therefore, the development would not result in any significant air quality issues.

Noise

Given the nature of uses within the adjacent area there is a need for a suitable level of acoustic insulation and ventilation to the property to attain acceptable internal noise standards within the

property whilst preventing overheating. The final details of this would be secured via a pre-commencement condition to be attached to any consent granted.

Any agreed acoustic insulation and acoustic ventilation scheme to deal with overheating would need to integrate effectively with existing adjacent businesses such as adjacent bars and late night clubs in accordance with the 'agent of change' principle set out in paragraph 193 of the NPPF.

Subject to conditions there are no amenity issues associated with the proposal that would impact on surrounding residential properties.

Crime and Disorder - The increased impression of activity from the re-use of this site would improve security and surveillance.

Waste and Recycling - Refuse and recycling facilities would be provided within a dedicate lower ground floor bin stores. Waste collections would take place from Sackville Street with bins brought out by residents on collection day. Bins for each type of waste would be clearly marked.

Disabled access – The development would have level access and a lift would provide access to the upper floors.

TV Reception - A Baseline TV and Radio Impact Assessment has been prepared based on technical modelling in accordance with published guidance to determine the potential effects on television and radio broadcast services.

Due to existing excellent coverage, robust nature of the digital terrestrial television (DTT) signal in the study area and the lack of receptors in any theoretical signal shadow area, the Proposed Development is not expected to have any adverse effect upon the reception of DTT services. The Proposed Development is likely to cause disruption to the reception of digital satellite television services in areas to the immediate northwest of the Site, within 32m from the base of the proposed building. In this area (Richmond Street), tower crane structures and the Proposed Development itself could obscure required views of the southeastern skies (where the satellites are located), resulting in reception interference. It should be noted that the risk of interference is very low due to the low number / lack of satellite dishes located in this area.

Due to the existing good coverage and robust technical nature of the broadcast radio network with respect to building-generated signal interference, the Proposed Development is not expected to affect the reception of VHF(FM) radio services.

It is recommended that any reported television or radio interference should be investigated by means of a post-construction reception measurement. Should there be any post construction impact a series of mitigation measures have been identified which could be controlled by a condition.

Conclusion

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations dictate otherwise. The proposals have been considered in detail against the policies of the current Development Plan and taken overall is considered not to be in compliance with it.

There is an acknowledged need for high quality residential accommodation in the city centre to support and sustain regional growth. The economic, social and environmental benefits of the proposal would not on balance outweigh the adverse physical and visual impacts of the development and the harm to heritage assets.

Due to the impact on heritage assets, its location in a conservation area, within the setting of listed buildings the proposal would not positively contribute to the high-quality regeneration of the area. This is principally as a result of the proposed loss of the NDHA and the proposed developments massing and external design and the quality of the architectural detailing. It would not add the overall quality of the area or have a visually attractive architectural form, which responds to local character and would undermine the ongoing regeneration of the City Centre. It would therefore be contrary to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012) or Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2

The proposed development would not relate positively to the character of the area, streetscene resulting in an unduly harmful impact on visual amenity contrary to policies SP1, CC9 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

The massing, design and architectural detailing of the proposal and its adverse impact on designated and non-designated heritage assets, would cause harm and would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the Whitworth Street Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings. The proposal would not successfully integrate into the local area due to its scale, massing and appearance resulting in an unduly harmful impact on the visual amenity and the character of the local area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies SP1, CC9, EN1, EN3 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), Policy JP-P2 of PfE and saved policies DC18 and DC19 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995).

The design would not reflect the City Councils regeneration aspirations in terms of quality and would not be sensitive to local character. It would not reflect government guidance on design. On this basis it would be contrary to paragraphs 131, 135 and 139 within the NPPF.

As set out in the NPPF all grades of harm may be justified on the grounds of public benefits that outweigh that harm taking account of the 'great weight' to be given to conservation and provided the justification is clear and convincing (paragraphs 205, 206, 207 and 208).

Considerable weight has been given to preserving and enhancing the character of the Whitworth Street Conservation Area and the setting of the adjacent listed buildings as required by virtue of the Listed Buildings Act and the overall impact of the proposal including the impact on heritage assets would not meet the tests set out in paragraphs 195, 203, 206, 207 and 208 of the NPPF. It has not been demonstrated that such a high level of harm is outweighed by public benefits (NPPF 202) nor that public benefits could not be achieved by a more sensitive scheme which would not require the wholesale destruction of the NDHA on the site.

The scheme would not comply with Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, paragraphs 128, 131, 135, 139, 157, 189, 195, 203, 206, 207, 208, 209 and 212 of the NPPF and Policies SP1, CC9, EN3, DM1 of Manchester City Core Strategy, PfE policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 and saved policies DC18 and DC19 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995). Given the above, it is considered that the proposal would be

inconsistent with national and local planning policy and should be refused for the reasons set out below.

Other Legislative Requirements

Equality Act 2010

Section 149 (Public Sector Equality Duty) of the Equality Act 2010 requires due regard to the need to: Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act and; Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. The Equality Duty does not impose a legal requirement to conduct an Equality Impact Assessment. Compliance with the Equality Duty involves consciously thinking about the aims of the Equality Duty as part of the process of decision-making.

Human Rights Act 1998 considerations

This application needs to be considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Under Article 6, the applicants (and those third parties, including local residents, who have made representations) have a right to a fair hearing and to this end the local planning authority must give full consideration to their comments.

Protocol 1 Article 1, and Article 8 where appropriate, confer(s) a right of respect for a person's home, other land and business assets. In taking account of all material considerations, including Council policy as set out in the Core Strategy and saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan, the Director of Planning, Building Control & Licensing has concluded that some rights conferred by these articles on the applicant(s)/objector(s)/resident(s) and other occupiers and owners of nearby land that might be affected may be interfered with but that that interference is in accordance with the law and justified by being in the public interest and on the basis of the planning merits of the development proposal. She believes that any restriction on these rights posed by the recommendation given is proportionate to the wider benefits of and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

Recommendation: Refuse

Article 35 Declaration

Officers have communicated their concerns about this proposal to the applicant during the course of the planning application, but these concerns have not been overcome. The proposal is considered to be contrary to the development plan, national policy and saved policies and therefore refused in a timely manner.

Reasons for recommendation to refuse

Reason 1: The proposal would result in the demolition of a non designated heritage which contributes positively to the character, appearance and significance of the Whitworth Street conservation area. The loss of the asset has not been substantiated with a clear and convincing justification. This would result in a high level of less than substantial harm to the historic environment which is not outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal.

The proposal is therefore contrary to policies SP1, CC8, CC9, EN1 and EN3 of the Manchester Core Strategy(2012), saved policies DC18 and DC19 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995), policies JP1-P1 and JP2-P2 of Places for Everyone Policies and the

relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework NPPF in particular, Sections 12 (Achieving well designed places) and 16 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) sections 66 and 72 of the Planning and Listed Buildings Act 1990.

Reason 2: The proposed development, by virtue of the siting, scale, massing, appearance and architectural detailing, would not deliver a well-designed, high quality development. The poor quality development would also fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the local area, particularly the Whitworth Street conservation area and setting of adjacent listed buildings.

The proposal would not successfully integrate into the local area resulting in an unduly harmful impact on the visual amenity. This would result in a high level of less than substantial harm to the historic environment which is not outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies SP1, CC8, CC9, EN1, EN3 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), policy JP1-P1 of Places for Everyone Policy The Guide to Development in Manchester SPD (2007), Manchester Residential Quality Guidance (July 2016), the relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021) in particular Section 12 (Achieving well designed places) and the National Design Guide (2021).

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Highway Services
Environmental Health
MCC Flood Risk Management
Heritage & Urban Design
City Centre Regeneration
Greater Manchester Police
United Utilities Water PLC
Environment Agency
Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service
Transport For Greater Manchester
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Basement, 61 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
Flat 1106, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 1207, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 1401, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 211, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 701, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 310, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 210, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 610, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 511, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 105, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 1007, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 209, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 509, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 41, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 24, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Third Floor, Amazon House, 3 Brazil Street, Manchester, M1 3PW
Advertising Right Site 121847.0, 33 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
Flat 11, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
41A Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
Flat 1, 47 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB

Arnero, 25 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
Flat 5, 27 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
Flat 7, 27 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
37 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
Flat 24, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 44, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 45, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 56, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Second Floor Rear, Albert House, 17 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3HZ
Third Floor Front Suite, Albert House, 17 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3HZ
Flat 303, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Basement, Princess House, 105 - 107 Princess Street, Manchester, M1 6DD
Flat 109, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 203, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 306, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 201, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 307, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 909, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 201, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 1203, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 507, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 907, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 411, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 409, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 408, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 1307, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
49 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
51 - 53 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
Flat At, New Union Hotel, Princess Street, Manchester, M1 6JB
Flat 205, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 1306, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 1107, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 804, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 109, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 611, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 805, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 901, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 609, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 403, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 23, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Second Floor, Amazon House, 3 Brazil Street, Manchester, M1 3PE
40 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3WA
Flat 26, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
41 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
43 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
40 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
45 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
50 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
Flat 41, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 63, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 31, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 65, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 33, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Third Floor Rear Suite, Albert House, 17 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3HZ

Flat 104, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 1102, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 101, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Second Floor Rear Left, Princess House, 105 - 107 Princess Street, Manchester, M1 6DD
Flat 404, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 204, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 1105, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 605, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 306, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 305, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 908, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 1110, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 703, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat At, G A Y, Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
Flat 1101, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 1004, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 212, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 102, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 503, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 1302, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 802, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 301, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 32, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 12, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 17, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 3, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 15, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 21, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 36, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 31, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 35, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 43, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
43 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
52 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
36 - 38 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3WA
Flat 25, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 62, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Fourth Floor And Mezzanine Floor, Albert House, 17 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3HZ
New York New York, 98 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
Flat 305, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 104, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 401, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 103, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 1104, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 1406, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 1010, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 203, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 1204, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
New Union Hotel, Princess Street, Manchester, M1 6JB
Flat 307, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 502, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 1402, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 606, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 204, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ

Flat 1205, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 905, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 2, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 36, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 21, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 33, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 44, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Ground Floor, Amazon House, 3 Brazil Street, Manchester, M1 3PW
44 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
47 - 49 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
Flat 2, 27 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
First Floor 37 And Part 39, 37 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
Ground Floor, 37 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
37 - 39B Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
39 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
Ground Floor, 39 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
28 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3NB
Basement, 28 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3NB
Flat 43, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 22, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 23, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 32, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 501, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 311, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 707, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 207, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 708, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 112, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 710, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 407, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 810, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 608, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 1003, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 206, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 1001, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 107, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Ground Floor And First Floor, 51 - 53 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
Second Floor, 61 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
61 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
MAT WRIGHT PHOTOGRAPHY LIMITED, First Floor, 61 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
46 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3WD
Flat 1006, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 111, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 702, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 1407, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 1202, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 1404, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 25, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 7, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
First Floor Front, Amazon House, 3 Brazil Street, Manchester, M1 3PW
25 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3NB
The Rembrandt, 33 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
Flat 5, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 42, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF

Flat 1, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
46 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
45 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
47 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
Flat 4, 27 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
Flat 8, 27 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
Basement, 37 - 39B Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
Flat 61, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 26, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 51, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
First Floor, Albert House, 17 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3HZ
Flat 107, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 302, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
100 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
Fourth Floor, Princess House, 105 - 107 Princess Street, Manchester, M1 6DD
Third Floor, Princess House, 105 - 107 Princess Street, Manchester, M1 1DD
Flat 106, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 206, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 304, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 410, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 508, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 1304, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 809, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 906, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 1108, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 601, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
55 - 59 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
Ground Floor, 61 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
G A Y, Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
Flat 602, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 207, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 308, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 303, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 103, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 1109, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 22, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
First Floor Rear, Amazon House, 3 Brazil Street, Manchester, M1 3PW
Fourth Floor, Amazon House, 3 Brazil Street, Manchester, M1 3PE
First Floor, 29 - 31 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
Second Floor And Third Floor, 29 - 31 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
Flat 6, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat Above, 51 - 53 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
Le Ville Hotel, 42 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3WD
29 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3JE
Flat 1, 27 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
Eva's, 27 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
Flat 3, 27 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
35 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
26 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3NB
Flat 64, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
28 - 30 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 42, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Ground Floor, Albert House, 17 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3HZ
Second Floor Front Right, Princess House, 105 - 107 Princess Street, Manchester, M1 6DD

Flat 202, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 102, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 205, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 405, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 1005, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 1405, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 401, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 1009, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 902, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 302, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 309, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 208, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 1303, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 803, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 603, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
51A Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
Flat 510, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 506, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 110, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 1103, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 801, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 807, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 404, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Basement And Sub Basement, Amazon House, 3 Brazil Street, Manchester, M1 3PW
First Floor Middle, Amazon House, 3 Brazil Street, Manchester, M1 3PW
Flat 55, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Icon Bar, Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
29 - 31 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
Flat 14, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat At, 29 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3JE
31 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3JE
Flat 6, 27 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
Flat 52, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 34, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 46, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 53, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 54, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Second Floor Front, Albert House, 17 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3HZ
Flat 1301, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Princess House, 105 - 107 Princess Street, Manchester, M1 6DD
Second Floor, Princess House, 105 - 107 Princess Street, Manchester, M1 6DD
Flat 403, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 108, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 406, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 910, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 101, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 705, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 1206, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 1008, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 904, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 903, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 106, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 402, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 709, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW

Flat 504, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 108, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 406, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 704, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 1002, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 1403, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 604, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 607, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 505, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 202, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 1201, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 34, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 16, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Basement And Ground Floor, 29 - 31 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
Flat 4, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
42 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
48 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
Centre Stage, 51 - 53 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LY
Oscars Bar, 34 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3WD
Flat 35, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Lower Ground Floor, Albert House, 17 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3JE
44A Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
113 Princess Street, Manchester, M1 3BF
109 Princess Street, Manchester, M1 6JB
Flat 301, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 402, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 105, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 110, 63 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3LR
Flat 405, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 808, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 806, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 1305, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
Flat 304, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AJ
Flat 706, Linter Building, 44 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 3AW
44 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3WD

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - City Centre PD Restriction - Class B1(a) To C3
Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Aircraft Safeguarding Zone - Aircraft Safeguarding Zone - All Exceeding 90M
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Conservation Area - Whitworth Street Conservation Area 1985
Area Team Boundary - Name: CENTRAL