

# Comments for Planning Application 137226/FO/2023

## Application Summary

Application Number: 137226/FO/2023

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

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

Case Officer: Lucy Harrison

## Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to these plans for the following reasons:

### Impact of Increased Traffic

The construction of four additional towers is expected to significantly increase traffic in the area. Building E1 is planned to have a car park entrance on Owen St., which is already a narrow and crowded street.

The Framework Travel Plan inaccurately claims that traffic on Owen St. is controlled by barriers, which have not been in use for at least three years and have since been removed due to impracticality. Additionally, while the plan states that Owen St. has red lines, these are frequently ignored by delivery drivers and vehicles from abroad, common in the area due to the towers' demographic.

Numerous parked vehicles on the stretch shared with towers E1 and E2 often force vehicles to swerve onto the pedestrian area, which is also used as a terrace by restaurants like Salvi's. The proposed car park entrance on Owen St. will increase the risk of accidents and injuries to pedestrians using the pavement or restaurant terraces. The increased vehicle flow will also pose higher risks to other road users and contribute to higher pollution and noise levels, especially given the high volume of food deliveries and taxis in the area late into the night.

Other road infrastructures also appear inadequate. According to the report Transport\_Note by Curtins, the estimates of vehicle traffic are unclear. The population of Deansgate Square mainly consists of wealthy students and young professionals who frequently use taxis. During term time, when buildings are at full capacity, vehicles often queue to enter the turning circle, with significantly more than 22 taxis per hour observed between 8 and 9 PM.

Food deliveries further compound the issue, with peak times between 7 and 10 PM, contrary to Curtins' estimates of 10-11 AM and 4-5 PM. Delivery drivers often find no place to stop and some have threatened to cease deliveries to the towers.

Given that the E1 car park entrance and E2 loading bay exit both lead onto Owen St., the current proposal is likely to cause serious chaos and danger. The plan to reduce Owen St. to one lane will exacerbate the situation, leading to more vehicles climbing onto pedestrian areas. The proposed traffic control measure using bollards is impractical given the volume of traffic, as previous barrier control at Deansgate Square was quickly abandoned due to mismanagement.

In summary, the proposed road infrastructure is inadequate for both Owen St. and the loading bays, leading to higher risks for pedestrians, cyclists, and other road users, as well as increased air and noise pollution. Furthermore, Curtins' assessment appears invalid, as it mistakenly assumes that towers C7 and C8 are smaller than E1 and E2. This incorrect sizing undermines their conclusion about loading space demands, making the entire report unreliable for informed decision-making.

### Natural Daylight - Deansgate Square

The GIA report claims that Deansgate Square will maintain average daylight levels comparable to similar developments and that residents have been aware of proposed developments for years. This latter assertion is completely untrue. It's surprising that Renaker, the applicant, hasn't corrected these statements, given that Renaker has marketed properties with much smaller buildings on the discussed plots. Numerous photos of these models are available, including those in the Great Jackson Street Development Framework by Deloitte. Many residents purchased properties based on the promised natural daylight.

The GIA report's assessment of average daylight is misleading. Visuals in figure 16 show that most of the west-facing side of the North Tower will receive low-level lighting, with a similar situation for the west side of the East Tower. Combined with the proposed 71-floor development on plot D and new constructions on the south and west sides, around two-thirds of the South Tower apartments will get very little daylight. The report itself seems incomplete, focusing on only one side of key buildings. For instance, the South Tower will be impacted on three sides: the south face by plot D, the west face by plots D, C7, C8, E1, and E2, and the north face by C7, C8, E1, and E2, yet the report lacks figures for these impacts. Curiously, it shows before-and-after

comparisons for unaffected buildings like City South while ignoring heavily impacted ones like the west side of the North Tower. These inconsistencies suggest bias in the report.

The loss of natural daylight will increase the need for internal lighting and heating, leading to higher CO2 emissions. This environmental impact is not considered in the planning application.

Deansgate Square residents have access to a green area on the west-facing side of the North Tower called the Roof Garden. Due to its position, the Roof Garden is windy and unwelcoming without natural sunlight. Its usage has declined since the construction of four towers on the west side of the Great Jackson development, which now block sunlight mid-afternoon. The proposed 72-floor tower and the four additional towers will completely deprive residents of direct sunlight in the Roof Garden, as shown in figure 16 of the GIA report. This green space, crucial for community events, will be unusable, impacting residents' wellbeing and community cohesion, which is known to positively affect crime rates, wellbeing, antisocial behavior, and loneliness.

The Roof Garden is also the only child-friendly area within Deansgate Square. The nearest alternative is the playground outside Crown Street School, which will also lose direct sunlight if the development proceeds.

Many properties were sold with the expectation of high levels of direct light and access to a green, communal, child-friendly Roof Garden. It is unacceptable, and possibly dishonest, to submit a development application that drastically reduces daylight for so many apartments. The situation at Deansgate Square should not be viewed as an average but should focus on the west-facing sides of the South, East, and North towers, disregarding the negligible impact on the geographically detached West Tower. The application contradicts the Greater Jackson Development Framework, which emphasizes "maximizing separation distances between buildings" and "enhancing sunlight and daylight penetration into the site."