



Planning and Tall Building Statement Addendum
Crown Street Plot D, Great Jackson Street

April 2024

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Planning Policy Considerations	4
3	Conclusions	10

1 Introduction

Introduction

1.1 This Planning Addendum ('Addendum') has been prepared by Deloitte LLP in support of an application for Full Planning Permission for the redevelopment of Plot D, identified in the Great Jackson Street Development Framework (2018) (GJS Development Framework) ('the Site').

1.2 An application with reference 137227/FO/2023 was submitted to Manchester City Council (MCC) in June 2023 for:

"Full planning permission for the demolition of existing structures and the erection of one residential building to a height of 71 storeys comprising 642 homes (Use Class C3) with food and drink uses (Use Class E) and / or drinking establishment (Sui Generis); and one office building (Use Class E); with basement car parking, cycle parking, landscaping and public realm, servicing and access arrangements, highway arrangements and associated works'.

1.3 The application was supported by a Planning and Tall Building Statement (PTBS) that considers the Proposed Development in its strategic and local urban context and assesses its acceptability in the context of the Development Plan and other material considerations.

1.4 Following the submission of the application, stakeholder comments have been received. In response, additional information is subsequently submitted that is relevant to the assessment in the PTBS particularly in relation to Section 6 of the statement in so far as it relates to compliance with the Great Jackson Street (GJS) Framework (2018), heritage impacts and townscape impacts.

1.5 Furthermore, a new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been published (December 2023). This has been reviewed and the changes do not materially impact the conclusions as presented in the Planning and Tall Building Statement or other supporting documents.

1.6 Places for Everyone (Pfe) was adopted in March 2024. All consultants have been asked to review whether the final policies, relevant to their discipline, impact the assessment and conclusions of their reports or ES Chapter. Confirmation of this will be sent under separate cover.

1.7 In addition, the reference to the Manchester Royal Infirmary Hospital (para 6.321) should be discounted from the PTBS.

1.8 It should be noted that the application (ref. 137227/FO/2023) was submitted concurrently with an application at Plot D of the Great Jackson Street Framework Ref: 137225/FO/2023 for:

"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."

2 Planning Policy Considerations

- 2.1 Section 6 of the PTBS includes a review of the Proposed Development against the relevant planning policies and material considerations.

Principle of the proposed use and contribution towards housing delivery

- 2.2 Under the above heading, Paragraphs 6.3 - 6.14 of the PTBS considers the use proposed within the planning application against the Development Plan and other material considerations including the GJS Framework.
- 2.3 This Addendum builds on the analysis in the PTBS to consider, among other things, the Proposed Development as against the statutory test in section S38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 ("PCPA 2004"), which provides: *'If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.'*
- 2.4 The PTBS confirms the Proposed Development accords with Development Plan as a whole, namely the relevant policies in the Core Strategy (2012) in line with the first part of Section 38(6) PCPA.
- 2.5 The Site falls within the City Centre and Regional Centre for which a number of Core Strategy Policies apply, which the Proposed Development fully comply with, these include:
- CC3 outlines the policy for housing within the City Centre, including number of new units and key locations for development. The policy outlines the Southern Gateway area, in which the Site is located, as a key location for residential development.
 - CC6 which focuses high density development in the City Centre, whereby, scale, massing and height will significantly exceed what is appropriate elsewhere in the City and will have regard to the Council's policy on tall buildings (EN2).
 - EC3 notes that housing is an appropriate use within the Regional Centre; residential uses should complement the development of mixed-use employment areas. Residential development in the Regional Centre will generally be higher density.
 - H1 notes that high density developments (over 75 units per hectare) are considered appropriate in both the City Centre and parts of the Regional Centre given the accessible location. Within the City Centre there is a presumption towards high density housing development, within mixed use schemes which contribute to regeneration initiatives by providing sustainable, well-designed accommodation which meets the needs of workers moving to Manchester.
- 2.6 Furthermore, since the submission of the application, Manchester City Council, as part of the PFE 2024, has committed to bringing forward the highest number of homes in the PFE period under Policy JP-H1. In addition, PFE enforces the ambition to bring forward urban / brownfield land for development. Policy JP-Strat2 supports the expanding role the City Centre plays in supporting residential development. With development in the City Centre being high density. The Proposed Development is fully in line with the relevant policies in PFE.

2.7 In accordance with the above policies, the mix of uses proposed by the Proposed Development is considered wholly appropriate. The principle of the height of the Proposed Development is also fully supported in planning terms. The second part of the S38(6) PCPA test should then be considered - addressing the material considerations for and against the Proposed Development. In this regard, due consideration has been given to the GJS Framework, which is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications in the area. The Proposed Development accords with the key objectives of the GJS Framework, as addressed in Table 6.1 of the Planning and Tall Building Statement. It is relevant to acknowledge that the masterplan drawings included in the GJS Framework and accompanying Development Matrix are indicative. Indeed, Manchester City Council's Executive Committee Report to the GJS Framework (January 2018) within the bullets at Paragraph 4.1 is clear:

- *... the purpose of the Strategic Regeneration Framework should be noted. The document is a high level masterplan and set of principles to provide a framework against which detailed proposals can come forward in the future. These proposals will be further interrogated and considered at the planning application stage in accordance with national and local policy requirements....*
- *The purpose of the framework is to set development principles which will form a material consideration in the determination of future applications. In relation to the development matrix it states 'indicative approximate heights and unit / floorspace breakdown. The heights and figures presented are indicative and will be subject to testing, in terms of relationship to heritage assets, microclimate and effect on residential amenity as part of future planning applications.*

2.8 The planning application materials clearly address and assess the instances in which the Proposed Development varies from the SRF's illustrative masterplan and the originally submitted DAS provides a clear comparison at page 30.

2.9 As schemes have come forward and been delivered across the GJS Framework area, it has continued to evolve in a manner that is consistent with the principles and guidance set out within the GJS Framework. New planning applications and the associated detailed design processes have identified design opportunities to improve the quality of the residential environment and public spaces. This has included reinforcing opportunities for height and introducing greater separation between buildings. It has also included increasing the quantum and the variety of public space, through the development of placemaking strategies (including improving connections between buildings and public spaces, ensuring positive activation of public spaces and providing spaces that are accessible and usable to all).

2.10 The Local Planning Authority has consistently applied the SRF flexibly, as demonstrated by the approval of other planning applications within the GJS Framework area. It should be noted that the GJS Framework identifies a number of plots in the masterplan that were approved at the time - Deansgate Square is identified as built, given planning permission had been granted and development was well progressed at the time of preparing the Framework. In addition, a planning application for Crown Street Phase 1 was being prepared at the same time as the GJS Framework and, as such, the Framework and Crown Street Phase 1 proposals are consistent. The SRF also identifies a layout for Plot E that reflected the planning permission Ref: 116850/FO/2017 although this was never progressed by the previous landowner and the planning permission has now lapsed.

2.11 Subsequent applications within the GJS Framework Area (notably at Crown Street Phase 2, Plot F and Plot G) have sought to reduce the number of buildings, whilst delivering taller buildings, thus increasing the quantum of public realm, building separation distances and daylight penetration. This directly corresponds to the guiding principles of the GJS Framework. Specifically Paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4 of the GJS Framework which state:

The Framework area does not currently include any public space, Renaker's Owen Street proposals will deliver a major new area of public space adjacent to the River Medlock, and there is a significant opportunity to create further public spaces within the Framework area for people to relax, play in and enjoy.

Complementing this should be a series of further public spaces and landscaped routes connecting to, and interacting with, the River Medlock and Manchester's wider green and blue infrastructure network, including Hulme Park.

2.12 Paragraph 3.8 of the GJS Framework further notes the key areas of change from the 2015 version of the Framework to be:

- *reinforcing previously identified opportunities for height;*
- *greater separation between buildings; and,*
- *increased quantum and variety of public space.*

2.13 All development brought forward within the Framework Area has been in line with, and sought to reinforce, these key guiding principles. The below table summarises the GJS Framework illustrative development matrix against the subsequent planning approvals.

	No. buildings		Building Heights		No. units		Public Space ha (%)	
	Framework	Approved	Framework	Approved	Framework	Approved	Framework	Approved
Crown Street Phase 2	3	2	31, 39 and 46	51 and 51	856	859	1.28 (58%)	1.35 (61%)
Plot F	3	2	33, 35 and 46	47 and 47	939	988	0.55 (63%)	0.59 (68%)
Plot G	3	2	23, 19 and 27	53 and 53	580	1,037	0.33 (47%)	0.35 (50%)

2.14 There is a clear accepted precedent that development does not need to strictly adhere to the illustrative masterplan or development matrix that accompanies the masterplan. Indeed, as previously noted, the GJS Framework is not prescriptive, rather, as a material planning consideration, development that accords with the principles and guidance set out in the GJS Framework, noted above, should be considered favourably as has been the case with Crown Street Phase 2, Plot F and Plot G.

2.15 Looking specifically at Plot D, the predominant land use is residential. Supporting this is a restaurant, below ground car parking and public realm, which is consistent with the GJS Framework.

2.16 The Proposed Development also includes a small standalone office, adjacent to the residential building. Whilst office use is not specifically identified within this part of the GJS Framework, it is appropriate in planning terms due to being in accordance with Development Plan Policies EC3 and CC1. Furthermore, the relatively modest scale and quantum of the development will not impact the delivery of the

residential-led masterplan. Moreover, it is considered that the office use complements the residential and commercial offer within the Great Jackson Street area and will deliver economic benefits.

2.17 The Design and Access Statement includes the design evolution process that has been undertaken resulting in the proposed 71 storey tower. As detailed at Page 30 of the Design and Access Statement, the consolidation of the two tall buildings, as envisaged in the GJS Framework, alongside the introduction of the office block, results in an increase of public realm around the building from 0.13ha (28% of the site area) to 0.18ha (38% of the site area). Care has been taken to focus this space into consolidated areas around building entrances and provide meaningful relationships with adjacent areas of public realm for successful, connected green infrastructure.

2.18 Furthermore, there are clearly articulated design benefits of including a single taller tower in this location, for example the Design and Access Statement at page 28 specifically notes:

The resultant massing is far more elegant in its proportions and helps to punctuate the centre of the masterplan's southern elevation, to break the uniformity of height that has developed along the Mancunian Way.

2.19 Reducing the number of towers from two to one has allowed the separation distances to increase thus allowing for more sunlight and daylight penetration into public spaces.

2.20 In terms of comparison with the development matrix in the GJS Framework, the consolidation of the two buildings has resulted in a small reduction of residential units across the site (from 685 anticipated in the Framework to 642 proposed). This remains consistent with guiding principles of the GJS Framework.

2.21 The increased area of public realm brings with it a range of very specific public benefits that would not come to fruition if the illustrative GJS Framework layout was strictly adhered to, these include:

- Improved pedestrian connection between Hulme and Manchester City Centre.
- Improved pedestrian footpath connection from the Mancunian Way bridge steps through to Great Jackson Street. This is a well-used footpath route and will be resurfaced as part of the Proposed Development to create a more inviting route.
- Maximised tree planting to create structure and add seasonal interest to the public realm.
- Enhanced connectivity to the public realm around Great Jackson Street, to create a more legible and pedestrian friendly environment.
- Enhanced streetscape by incorporating high quality materials.

2.22 Coupled with the above are the wider benefits of the proposals detailed in Section 7 of the Planning and Tall Building Statement and summarised in the below section.

2.23 Taking into consideration S38(6) PCPA accordingly, and for the reasons stated above and in the PTBS, it is considered that evolution of the Proposed Development results in a proposal that overall accords with the key principles and objectives of the GJS Framework which weighs heavily in favour of the Proposed Development.

Heritage and Townscape

- 2.24 Under the above heading, Paragraphs 6.27 – 6.37 of the Planning and Tall Building statement consider the heritage and townscape impacts of the proposal.
- 2.25 Since the submission of the application, an updated Heritage Statement (HS) and an addendum to the Townscape and Visual Impact (TVIA) Chapter of the ES have been submitted. Both assessments now include a night-time assessment.
- 2.26 The updated HS concludes that the Proposed Development results in some instances of ‘less than substantial harm’ in NPPF terms, to the setting of the surrounding heritage assets scoped into the assessment, albeit at the lowest end of this scale.
- 2.27 The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out the general duty on decision makers in exercising their planning functions with respect to heritage assets. Section 66 requires:
- “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the LPA or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State, 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...”*
- 2.28 Section 72 sets out the corresponding duty in relation to conservation areas, it requires:
- “In the exercise, with respect to any building or other land in a conservation area, of any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area...”*
- 2.29 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF notes that one of the key dimensions to sustainable development is protecting and enhancing our historic environment.
- 2.30 Paragraph 205 requires that when considering the impact of the Proposed Development on the significance of the asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation, the more important the asset the greater the weight should be.
- 2.31 Paragraph 208 of the NPPF states that:
- “Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.”*
- 2.32 The PTBS sets out the public benefits of the proposals at Paragraph 1.10 and Section 7 which can be summarised as:
- Providing a viable use of an underused brownfield site;
 - Supporting employment opportunities and economic growth;
 - Helping to meet the recognised demand for City Centre living;
 - Improving the vitality of the area;
 - Providing a significant area of new high-quality public realm;

- Improving pedestrian and cycle connections;
- Providing high quality, highly visible, well-designed buildings;
- Incorporating sustainable technologies as appropriate; and
- Designing a place to be accessible to all users.

- 2.33 It is clear, applying the Paragraph 208 balance of the NPPF, that the very considerable public benefits of the proposals considerably and demonstrably outweigh the identified instances of less than substantial heritage harm (all of which are at the lowest end of this scale).
- 2.34 The updated Heritage Statement and TVIA addendum chapter considers night time views of this application and Plot D (137227/FO/2023). The Heritage Statement considers the night-time impact of previously assessed viewpoints – 11 and 12 – as well as an additional viewpoint 18.
- 2.35 The Heritage Statement notes a neutral impact at Viewpoint 11 and a negligible adverse impact at Viewpoint 12, which results in NPPF terms in the case of Viewpoint 11 in no heritage harm and in the case of Viewpoint 12 in less than substantial harm at the lowest end of this scale.
- 2.36 Again, for the reasons set out above, it is clear applying the Paragraph 208 balance that such instances of less than substantial harm (all of which are at the lower end of this scale) are significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the very considerable public benefits of the proposals as noted above and in the PTBS. The TVIA concludes that the Proposed Development (Crown Street Phase 3 and Plot D) fills a void in development within the GJS Framework area, and that the design quality distinguishes them from the existing towers. In this regard, the night-time impact ranges from negligible to moderate beneficial.

3 Conclusions

- 3.1 This Planning Addendum has been prepared by Deloitte LLP in support of a Full Planning Application for the development of Plot D Framework for a 71 storey residential building and separate office block.
- 3.2 The conclusions of the Planning and Tall Building Statement at Section 7 of the Report remain.
- 3.3 Overall, and for the reasons set out above and in the PTBS, applying section 38(6), it is clear, firstly, that the Proposed Development accords with the Development Plan overall and, secondly, that the material considerations individually and collectively weigh very heavily in favour of the Proposed Development. As such, these proposals should be supported by MCC.



This report has been prepared for Renaker Build Ltd and on the understanding that it will be made publicly available.

All copyright and other proprietary rights in the report remain the property of Deloitte LLP and any rights not expressly granted in these terms or in the Contract are reserved.

No party other than Renaker Build Ltd is entitled to rely on the report for any purpose whatsoever and thus we accept no liability to any other party who is shown or gains access to this document.

The information contained within this report is provided to assist Renaker Build Ltd with this Planning Application. The report makes use of a range of third-party data sources. Whilst every reasonable care has been taken in compiling this report, Deloitte LLP cannot guarantee its accuracy.

If this document contains details of an arrangement that could result in a tax or National Insurance saving, no such conditions of confidentiality apply to the details of that arrangement (for example, for the purpose of discussion with tax authorities).

Deloitte LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC303675 and its registered office at 1 New Street Square, London, EC4A 3HQ, United Kingdom.

Deloitte LLP is the United Kingdom affiliate of Deloitte NSE LLP, a member firm of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, a UK private company limited by guarantee ("DTTL"). DTTL and each of its member firms are legally separate and independent entities. DTTL and Deloitte NSE LLP do not provide services to clients. Please see www.deloitte.com/about to learn more about our global network of member firms. Real Estate Services regulated by RICS.

© 2024 Deloitte LLP. All rights reserved.