

Planning Proof of Evidence



Appeal under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) by Dandara Living Developments Limited

Against the decision of Manchester City Council in refusing Planning Permission for the redevelopment of Land Junction of Parrs Wood Lane, Manchester, M20 5AA (ref. 133746/FO/2022)

Appeal ref. APP/B4215/W/23/3314646

25 April 2023

Contents

1 Introduction 3

2 Contextual Background to the Appeal 6

3 Compliance with the Adopted Development Plan 7

4 Addressing the Reasons for Refusal 13

5 Response to Third Party Representations 16

6 Summary and Conclusion 17

Appendix A - Response to third party representations prepared by Mr Harry Bolton

Appendix B - Design Response Statement prepared by Mr Stephen Hodder

Appendix C - Urban Design Peer Review preapred by Mr Colin Pullan

Appendix D - Heritage Architecture Heritage Note prepared by Stephen Levrant Heritage Architecture

1 Introduction

Qualifications and Experience

- 1.1 My name is Harry Bolton and I am a Senior Director in the Planning and Development team at CBRE Limited based in Manchester. I am a Chartered Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) (no. 49430) and hold a MSC degree in Town Planning from Liverpool John Moores University. I am also an Associate Member of the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA).
- 1.2 I have 17 years' experience in private planning practice and joined CBRE Limited in 2013. I have advised many public and private sector clients on a range of planning matters including residential developments. I have significant experience in the preparation of planning applications and planning appeals, including acting as expert witness.
- 1.3 In preparation of this evidence I have visited the application site, am familiar with the surrounding area and have studied the relevant national and local planning policy.
- 1.4 CBRE Limited was instructed by Dandara Living Developments Limited in September 2022 to provide planning advice in respect of this planning appeal following refusal of planning permission (ref. 133746/FO/2022) by Manchester City Council ('the Council') on 2 August 2022. Neither my firm nor I were involved with the original planning application.
- 1.5 This proof of evidence has been provided consistent with my professional code of conduct, I understand that my primary duty is to the inquiry and this evidence is therefore presented as my professional opinion irrespective of by whom I am instructed. I confirm that I have made clear which facts and matters referred to in this report are within my own knowledge and which are not. Those that are within my own knowledge I confirm to be true. The opinions I have expressed represent my true and complete professional opinions on the matters to which they refer.

Scope of Evidence

- 1.6 This Planning Proof of Evidence ('PPoE') has been prepared on behalf of Dandara Living Development Limited ('the Appellant') in relation to Appeal ref. APP/B4215/W/23/3314646 pursuant to Section 78(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). In drafting this PPoE due regard has been had to the Planning Inspectorate's ('PINS') Procedural Guide: Planning appeals – England (December 2022).
- 1.7 This PPoE should be read in conjunction with Dandara Living Developments Limited's ('the Appellant') Statement of Case ('SoC'). Subsequent to the submission of the Appeal and provision of additional

transport evidence, Manchester City Council ('the Council') has now confirmed in its SoC and in the agreed Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG') that "...following careful consideration of the matters before the Inspector the Council considers that the overall planning balance for this form of development in this location is altered to one in favour of the grant of consent and that the Council does not contest the three reasons for refusal as a result."

- 1.8 The Council have reviewed their position and do not now intend to defend the Reasons for Refusal ('RfR'). The issues contained within RfR 1, 2 and 3 are therefore now agreed between the Appellant and the Council, with the Appeal scheme considered to accord with the adopted development plan when taken as a whole. However, notwithstanding this, there has been significant interest in the proposed development by third parties. Therefore, I will continue to address RfR 1 and other relevant planning matters raised by third parties. Where appropriate, I will refer to statements appended to the PPoE in support of the Appellant's case relating to design and heritage matters.
- 1.9 A Highways PoE ('HPoE') has been prepared by the Appellant's transport and highways witness, Mr Carl Peers and I rely upon their expert opinion in forming my planning judgement. It is considered that Mr Peers' evidence fully addresses RfR 2 and 3 and as such detailed further commentary is not provided in this PPoE. In forming my overall judgment I rely upon Mr Peers evidence together with that of those other experts whose reports have been provided on behalf of the Appellant, both at Application stage as well as those set out at paragraph 5.3 of my evidence.

The Appeal and Further Evidence

- 1.10 Subsequent to the Planning Appeal being lodged by Dandara Living Developments Limited on 13 January 2023 both the Appellant and Council have actively engaged in order to reduce the matters of disagreement between the parties.
- 1.11 As noted in Mr Peers evidence, a 'Further Highways Evidence' report was prepared and submitted to Council Highways Officers and Transport for Greater Manchester ('TfGM') to present further highways and transport related information including survey results, traffic figures, traffic model, and traffic model results summary. This further information was discussed with Council Highways Officers and TfGM on 15th March 2023 and the findings subsequently agreed on 23rd March 2023.
- 1.12 On 21st March a meeting was held with Council Planning Officers to discuss and agree the SoCG. An extension of time was subsequently sought from PINS for the submission of the SoCG and the Council's SoC until Monday 27th March 2023 in order that the Council could re-assess its position based on the further highways evidence.
- 1.13 Having fully reviewed the additional highways information submitted by the Appellant it was confirmed in the agreed SoCG and the Council's SoC, submitted to PINS, that the Council would now not contest

the three reasons for refusal as previously noted. Accordingly this appeal is unopposed by the Council - a matter upon which I invite the Inspector to place considerable weight.

Structure of this PPOE

1.14 This PPOE is structured as follows:

- **Section 2** – Contextual background;
- **Section 3** – Compliance with adopted Development Plan Documents and other relevant material considerations, including emerging policy;
- **Section 4** – Addressing the reasons for refusal;
- **Section 5** – Response to the third party representations received as part of the appeal (i.e. those received prior to the re-consultation dated 5th April); and
- **Sections 6** – Summary and conclusion

2 Contextual Background to the Appeal

Site Context

2.1 Details of the site context together with background to the application and this appeal are clearly set out in the Appellant's SoC as well as in the agreed SoCG. As such, these sections are not repeated in this PPOE although a summary of the important key site characteristics are included below:

- i. **Underused previously developed land** – The Appeal site currently comprises underused brownfield land in a sustainable location. The existing surface car park is surplus to Tesco's current requirements and its redevelopment would not impact on Tesco's ability to meet their needs at peak times during normal operations.
- ii. **Sustainability and accessibility** - The site is situated in a highly accessible location with a Greater Manchester Accessibility (GMAL) rating of Level 8 ('excellent') as defined by TfGM. It is easily accessed by active travel (walking and cycling) and is located in close proximity to public transport modes including bus, Metrolink and train. The Appeal site represents a highly sustainable location for residential development with it being in walking and cycling distance of a range of amenities typically associated with a district centre (see table 2.1 of the Appellant SoC).
- iii. **Surrounding scale and density** - The surrounding area is characterised by buildings of a mixed of scale and form. There a number of taller residential buildings in the vicinity of the Site including CitiPeaks and Parrs Wood Court as well as non- residential buildings including Parrs Wood Entertainment Centre.
- iv. **Statutory and Non-Statutory Designations** – The site is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory heritage, nature conservation or landscape designations and is situated within Flood Zone 1. A small portion of the site falls within the Greater Manchester Combined Authority Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). A clock tower from the now demolished former Manchester bus depot remains on site, but has now been identified as not having any heritage significance, albeit it is acknowledged to be local landmark in the streetscene.

3 Compliance with the Adopted Development Plan

3.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that *“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”*.

3.2 The relevant adopted development plan covering the Appeal site comprises the following:

- i. ‘Saved’ Policies of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan (‘UDP’) (adopted July 1995); and
- ii. Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (‘CS’) (adopted July 2012)

3.3 The three RfR do not reference any ‘saved’ UDP policies and as such I will focus only on the CS policies referenced within the RfR.

Weight to be afforded to the Core Strategy

3.4 The Core Strategy was subject to Examination in Public in November 2011 and was adopted in July 2012 following receipt of the Inspectors Report in March 2012. It is based on pre-2012 evidence, including the 2010 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and now superseded national guidance contained in the Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) and Planning Policy Statement (PPS) documents.

3.5 The Core Strategy has not been reviewed since it was adopted nearly 11 years ago and therefore it hasn’t taken account of changing circumstances, including to national guidance, as required by paragraph 33 of the NPPF. In accordance with NPPF paragraph 219 the weight that can be attributed to relevant CS policies is dependent upon their level of consistency with the current Framework, the closer the policies in the plan are to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight to be given to them.

3.6 Table 3.1 below provides an assessment of the relevant CS policies against the provisions of the NPPF. In it I identify the policies of most relevance to the determination of the appeal, whether the proposals are compliant with them currently and the weight that I consider should be attributed to them based on the merits of the scheme (i.e. full, significant, moderate, limited and no weight).

Table 3.1 – Compliance with Development Plan Policy and Weight to be Attributed			
Policy	Up to Date	Appeal Proposal Accordance with Policy	Weight Attributed
SP1	Partially. Whilst the broad thrust of the policy appears to be in line with national policy there are two areas where I consider the policy to be out of step: 1. Paragraph 62 of the NPPF is explicit that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies. Importantly this those who require affordable housing and people who rent their homes. Diverse housing referenced in the policy doesn't appear to cover the full spectrum of local housing need. 2. Reference to the need for developments to comply with Strategic Regeneration Frameworks (SRF's) which have not been through a formal examination process is not compatible with national policy.	Yes. Policy SP1 places an emphasis on creating neighbourhoods of choice which provide “<i>high quality and diverse housing around district centres which meet local needs</i>” (emphasis in bold) It states that the majority but not all new residential development will be in the inner areas (outside of which the site falls). The policy then requires that all development has compliance with SRF's, including the South Manchester SRF, which was 'adopted' as a material consideration by the Council in 2007. Given the length of time that has passed since this document was prepared (16 years), its lack of consistency with the NPPF and the fact that it doesn't form part of the Local Plan it is considered that no weight can be attributed to the SRF. As highlighted in the Appellant's SoC (para 6.12) the proposed BtR development can be viewed as 'diverse housing' as it is a unique tenure type meaning it can meet an identified need for residents within the local area such as those looking for sustainably located rental properties and affordable housing. Given the affordability challenges in South Manchester this is particularly important. In terms of overall delivery of affordable housing since 2012 the 2021 Annual Monitoring Report indicates that the Council	Moderate

		had delivered just 2,129 net additional affordable dwellings, circa. 3.5% of the overall housing target of 60,000. The figures have not been further broken down into sub-areas within the City however it is evident that affordability issues persist in South Manchester. The proposed development will provide a policy compliant level of affordable housing that will contribute to meeting local need. Moreover, the proposed development will maximise the efficient use of brownfield land in a highly sustainable location close to public transport, jobs, services, education and open space. The proposed development is of high quality and its design positively responds to its surrounding context. Taken as a whole I consider that the Appeal scheme is in compliance with policy SP1.	
H1	No. As Manchester's Core Strategy was adopted in July 2012, its housing requirement figures became out of date in July 2017. This is confirmed by the Council in its own Annual Monitoring Report (2021). In the absence of an up to date local plan requirement, the local authority is required to use the government's standard methodology to calculate the housing requirement.	<i>Yes. Policy H1 sets an overall housing requirement of approximately 60,000 across the plan period with approximately 3,240 dwellings to be delivered in South Manchester. It is important to note that these figures are not maximums or caps on the delivery of new homes. The Council's most recent Annual Monitoring Report (2021) confirms that the Core Strategy housing target became out of date in 2017.</i> <i>Notwithstanding this, the Council's Annual Monitoring Reports between 2012-2021</i>	Limited

		<i>indicate that 34,712 net additional new dwellings are required from 2020 to 2027. In South Manchester the number of new net additional dwellings required to be delivered across the remainder of the plan period was 1,308 as of 2021.</i> <i>In terms of the other elements of the policy the proposed development:</i> <i>• Supports growth on a previously developed site in a sustainable location and takes into account the limited availability of developable sites in these areas;</i> <i>• Contributes to the character of the local area, makes appropriate usable amenity spaces (including balconies) and provides adequate parking for cars and bicycles</i> <i>• Prioritises a site which is in close proximity to centres or high frequency public transport routes; and;</i> <i>• Is designed to give privacy to both its residents and neighbours.</i> <i>As noted in the Council's Written Statement dated 25th April 2023 (paragraph 2.1-2.3) the Council had "identified harm as a result of the scheme's density in respect of the proposed car parking levels and the consequential impacts on nearby streets, and, highway congestion in the vicinity of the site.</i> <i>As part of the preparation for the appeal the Council has reviewed the overall planning balance against the additional evidence prepared by the appellant. It has concluded that the provision of additional residential</i>	
--	--	--	--

		<i>development in this specific location combined with a policy compliant affordable housing component and other measures to manage the car parking within the proposed development and access by residents to a Car club hire scheme, all to be secured via a unilateral undertaking prepared by the appellant, is considered to result in the planning balance being in favour of the grant of consent and that this form of residential development in this location”</i> <i>Overall, I consider the proposed development accords with Policy H1.</i>	
H6	No. As Manchester’s Core Strategy was adopted in July 2012, its housing requirement figures became out of date in July 2017. This is confirmed by the Council in its own Annual Monitoring Report (2021). The policy is based on evidence that it is over a decade old and therefore not reflective of current housing needs. It also does not reflect paragraph 105 which encourages significant development focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes.	Yes. As described at paragraph 6.15 of the SoC this policy does not state that say that high density proposals would <u>only</u> be appropriate in district centres and were it to do so then it would be out of step with national policy which imposes no such restriction. Policy H6 does not stipulate that high density proposals outside district centres would be inappropriate or must be refused, and has not been reviewed in the light of up to date national policy. In terms of the priorities outside district centres the proposed development would contribute to an identified need for new homes, including affordable housing in area where affordability is a key concern (as noted at paragraph 4.58 of the emerging PfE).	Limited
T1	Yes. The policy is considered to be largely in accordance with national policy.	Yes. The transport assessment information that has been submitted in support of the Appeal demonstrates that the proposals fully accord with policy T1.	Full

T2	Yes. The policy is considered to be largely in accordance with national policy albeit there continue to be references to the now abolished Regional Strategy.	Yes. The transport assessment information that has been submitted in support of the Appeal demonstrates that the proposals fully accord with policy T2	Full
DM1	Yes. The policy is considered to be largely in accordance with national guidance, with the exception of reference to Code for Sustainable Homes.	Yes. Sufficient detail has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development is a high quality scheme that will positively contribute to the character of the surrounding area.	Significant

- 3.7 Drawing on the above table I consider that CS policies SP1, H1, H6 and DM1 should be afforded reduced weight in the determination of the Appeal due to inconsistencies with the current NPPF. Notwithstanding this, I consider that the proposed development complies with all of the CS policies identified in the RfR, and conforms with the development plan taken as a whole.

Weight to be afforded to the Emerging Places for Everyone

- 3.8 The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document ('PfE') will form part of the Development Plan for Manchester upon adoption. It has been subject to significant public consultation with an Examination in Public taking place between 1 November 2022 and 30 March 2023. In light of this, I consider that the emerging PfE is at an advanced stage of preparation and is consistent with the provisions of the current NPPF. Therefore, in accordance with paragraph 48 of the NPPF I consider that it can be given moderate weight in the determination of the Appeal.

4 Addressing the Reasons for Refusal

Reason for Refusal 1

- 4.1 The first reason for refusal on the Council's decision reads "*The proposal is for a high density form of residential development outside of an identified district centre that does not address the housing needs of the area. As such the proposals do not accord with policies SP1, H1 and H6 of the adopted Manchester Core Strategy*".
- 4.2 This reasons for refusal is no longer contested by the Council which now accepts that the appeal scheme is in accordance with the development plan, including CS policies SP1, H1 and H6.
- 4.3 As described in table 3.1 above and the Appellant's SoC I consider that the proposed development is fully compliant with CS policies SP1, H1 or H6 and would provide significant benefits including the provision of much need affordable housing in an area of Manchester where affordability is a significant issue.
- 4.4 In addition to the above, the emerging PfE, which in my view can be afforded a moderate degree of weight in the determination of this appeal, has a strong focus 'brownfield preference' and seeks to direct 90% of new housing to previously developed land over the plan period to 2037 (para. 1.42). Draft policies JP-Strat 9 'Southern Areas' and JP-S 1 'Sustainable Development' place a strong emphasis on prioritising the re-use of brownfield land/ previously developed land whilst draft policy JP-H 4 'Density of New Housing' and draft policy JP-C 1 'An Integrated Network' look to deliver increased density close to public transport stops thereby minimising both the need to travel and the distance travelled by unsustainable modes .
- 4.5 I also want to highlight that NPPF paragraphs 120 (c and d) and 125 (a and c) support the development of underutilised land and buildings to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and that "substantial weight" should be given to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes. Indeed, it is noted that it is especially important that decisions avoid homes being built at low densities with developments making optimal use of sites.
- 4.6 I consider that the Appeal scheme also complies with the relevant policies of the development plan when read as a whole and will deliver significant benefits including 20% affordable housing provision which demonstrably outweigh any potential adverse impacts. In accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out at paragraph 11 c) of the NPPF permission ought to be granted without delay in line with national policy. Furthermore even on a flat balance the statutory

presumption of s.38(6) of the 1990 Act is engaged and there no material considerations to outweigh that presumption such that permission ought to be granted even on a 'flat' balance..

4.7 Nevertheless, in my opinion the most relevant CS policies are also 'out-of-date' in line with my assessment in table 3.1 therefore the tilted balance is engaged by reason of paragraph 11(d)(ii). It is not disengaged by any of the considerations within footnote 7 to NPPF.

4.8 It has been demonstrated through the planning application and the Appellant's Appeal evidence that the proposed development would not give rise to unacceptable adverse impacts, let alone sufficient to outweigh the tilted balance (or even the flat balance). This has been formally agreed with the Council through the SoCG. Importantly, the proposed development would secure significant benefits including, but not limited to:

- i. Securing 20% on-site affordable housing provision and meet a recognised demand for high quality residential accommodation in the local area;
- ii. Facilitating the beneficial re-use of an underused surface car park, which is surplus to requirements, in a highly sustainable location within close walking distance of public transport provisions, amenities, services and facilities; and
- iii. Supporting employment opportunities during the construction and operational phases of the development.

4.9 Overall, in my professional opinion:

- (i) The scheme accords with the development plan taken as a whole and s.38(6) is engaged, and accordingly so is the policy presumption of paragraph 11(c) of NPPF. There are insufficient material considerations to outweigh that statutory presumption;
- (ii) The scheme also benefits from the presumption in favour of sustainable development by reason of paragraph 11(d)(ii). The benefits of the proposals are significant and would demonstrably outweigh any potential adverse impacts when assessed against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole.

Reason for Refusal 2

4.10 The second reason for refusal on the Council's decision reads "*The proposals fail to provide an adequate level of on-site car parking to serve the proposed residential units contrary to policies DM1 and T2 of the adopted Manchester Core Strategy*"

4.11 This reason for refusal is no longer contested by the Council which now accepts that the appeal scheme is in accordance with the development plan, including CS policies DM1 and T2, following the submission of further transport evidence by the Appellant.

- 4.12 Mr Peer's HPoE addresses the matter of parking in detail and on the basis that the technical detail is accepted my professional judgement is that the proposed development fully accords CS policies DM1 and T2.

Reason for Refusal 3

- 4.13 The third reason for refusal on the Council's decision reads "*The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not give rise to unacceptable impacts to congestion on the highway network contrary to policy T1 of the adopted Manchester Core Strategy.*"
- 4.14 This reason for refusal is no longer contested by the Council which now accepts that the appeal scheme is in accordance with the development plan, including CS policy T1.
- 4.15 Mr Peer's HPoE provides further evidence which demonstrates that the proposals will not give rise to unacceptable highways impacts. On the basis that the technical detail is accepted my professional judgement is that the proposed development fully accords CS policy T1.

5 Response to Third Party Representations

- 5.1 There have been a number of third party representations received in respect of the Appeal following the Council's formal notification to interested parties/ neighbouring properties dated 17 February 2023.
- 5.2 A subsequent notification was issued by the Council on 5 April 2023 confirming that further highway information had been received from the Appellant which addresses the three reasons for refusal. The letter also advises that based on this information the Council has concluded that it does not wish to contest the three reasons for refusal and will only be at the Inquiry in an assisting capacity to the Inspector. The deadline for comments runs until 28 April 2023 and as such I have not responded to comments received in relation to the re-consultation.
- 5.3 The representations received cover a number of matters, some of which relate to the reasons for refusal and others which do not. In the interest of completeness, in **Appendix A** I provide responses to comments received which have been organised thematically. To support these responses I refer, as necessary, to Mr Peers' HPoE and supporting statements appended to this PPOE including:
- i. **Appendix B** - Design Statement prepared Mr Stephen Hodder – Hodder + Partners – who concludes that the scheme comprises high quality design;
 - ii. **Appendix C** - Urban Design Peer Review prepared by Mr Colin Pullan - Lambert Smith Hampton – who concludes that the scheme is contextually appropriate to the townscape;
 - iii. **Appendix D** - Heritage Note prepared by Stephen Levrant Heritage Architecture – who conclude that there is no effect upon any recognised designated or undesignated heritage asset; and who conclude that the clock tower is of negligible interest in heritage terms; and instead concludes that its local 'landmark' status is unaltered by the appeal proposals.

6 Summary and Conclusion

- 6.1 As set out in the SoCG all three RfR have been agreed between the Appellant and the Council, with the Appeal scheme considered by both parties to fully accord with the adopted development plan when taken as a whole.
- 6.2 The Appeal site comprises underused previously developed land in a highly sustainable and accessible urban location.
- 6.3 Section 38(6) of the 2004 Act provides that the Appeal must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 6.4 As described in table 3.1 above and the Appellant's SoC I consider that the proposed development is fully compliant with CS policies SP1, H1, H6, T1, T2 and DM1 and would provide significant benefits including:
- i. Securing 20% on-site affordable housing provision and meet a recognised demand for high quality residential accommodation in the local area;
 - ii. Facilitating the beneficial re-use of an underused surface car park, which is surplus to requirements, in a highly sustainable location within close walking distance of public transport provisions, amenities, services and facilities; and
 - iii. Supporting employment opportunities during the construction and operational phases of the development.
- 6.5 In my opinion the most relevant CS policies are also 'out-of-date' in line with my assessment in table 3.1 therefore the tilted balance is engaged by reason of paragraph 11(d)(ii). It is not disengaged by any of the considerations within footnote 7 to NPPF.
- 6.6 Supporting statements have been provided on behalf of the Appellant (Appendix A-C) in respect of design and heritage matters which conclude that the scheme:
- i. comprises high quality design
 - ii. is contextually appropriate to the townscape;
 - iii. would have no effect upon any recognised designated or undesignated heritage assets (including the clock tower which is of negligible interest in heritage terms); and
 - iv. would not alter the local 'landmark' status of the clock tower.

- 6.7 I consider that all other matters raised by third party representations have been suitably addressed as part of the planning application or appeal submission (**Appendix A**).
- 6.8 In conclusion, in my professional opinion:
- (iii) The scheme accords with the development plan taken as a whole and s.38(6) is engaged, and accordingly so is the policy presumption of paragraph 11(c) of NPPF. There are insufficient material considerations to outweigh that statutory presumption; and
 - (iv) The scheme also benefits from the presumption in favour of sustainable development by reason of paragraph 11(d)(ii). The benefits of the proposals are significant and would demonstrably outweigh any potential adverse impacts when assessed against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole.
- 6.9 In light of the information available in this case, I consider that the planning balance falls in favour of the grant of planning permission.

Appendices

Appendix A - Response to third party representations prepared by Harry Bolton

Consultation Theme	Consultation Response Extract	Appellant Response
Overdevelopment, Scale and Massing	<i>“The design footprint is much too large for the small footprint of land, overshadowing nearby buildings and trees.”</i> <i>“The area is already overcrowded both in terms of houses/residential properties”</i> <i>“It's Way too large.”</i> <i>“There is no adequate space for this project”</i> <i>“This is an overdevelopment of the space in question”</i> <i>“the proposed building seems out of character with the local surroundings”</i> <i>“It’s just such a bad idea cramming a tremendous amount of flats into a small area.”</i> <i>“The density of the development is good, it’s space efficient and better for environment.”</i> <i>“this proposed new building because it is too big for the site”</i> <i>“I find this development grossly supersized for the proposed plot.”</i> <i>“There is not enough room for these flats or parking for all the extra cars and its right near a large school”</i> <i>“The proposal is for housing that is too dense, too tall, and out of keeping with the area”</i>	The proposed scheme has been designed by Hodder & Partners who have extensive experience in creating high quality residential developments across Manchester. The contextual approach taken is fully explained in the Mr Hodder’s supporting statement at Appendix B. In the interest of robustness an independent urban design peer review was commissioned by the Appellant. Mr Colin Pullan of Lambert Smith Hampton, who has over 35 years’ experience as an urban designer in the private sector, covering all design matters, reviewed the scheme proposals from a design, having regard all supporting information and a site visit. The urban design peer review is appended in full at Appendix C. It concludes that: <i>“The scheme would provide a high quality, well designed development that optimises the use of this brownfield site whilst being sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area.</i> <i>Having undertaken an appraisal of the appeal scheme against the criteria set by the NPPF, the NDG and supporting local policy and guidance; I consider that the building would be of high quality. In my opinion, the</i>

	<i>" I will be able to see these flats from my upstairs windows - and this impacts my privacy. I bought the house as it is so private so this is a major dislike for me"</i> <i>"The development is too large for the plot of land."</i> <i>"this apartment block is wrong for the land in size and appearance"</i> <i>"The land is also not big enough for this sort of development"</i> <i>"My objections to this plan include that it will higher than any other building in the area. It is too small an area to accommodate so many flats and will make an already very congested area more congested"</i> <i>"This proposal is however absolutely not the right development for this location nor an appropriate solution for the site"</i> <i>"There is not enough space for a 6 storey development in the triangle section of the Tesco car pay."</i> <i>"This development is completely inappropriate in this position"</i> <i>"Concerned regarding [...]the size of the building which seems very large"</i> <i>"There isn't the space here for such a development"</i> <i>"The size is out of keeping with the area- will be tallest block in vicinity."</i> <i>"It's height is out of keeping for the site and will enclose an area that should have natural light and the view of a charming green triangle of old established trees and grass with beds of daffodils and crocuses"</i>	<i>scheme is well-designed and contextually appropriate having regard to local character"</i> Overall, as described in the Appellant's SoC (para. 2.19 and 6.35) and paragraph 2.1 of the PPOE the scale and massing of the proposed development is consistent with other buildings in the immediate vicinity of the site.
--	--	--

	<i>"Also the proposed building is significantly taller than anything in the area, it is not in keeping and will make the Parrs wood area over crowded, dark and a cramped place to live."</i> <i>"It is too high even compared to 4 story development opposite"</i> <i>"The six-storey scale of this proposal is also totally inappropriate for the area. It's taller than the historic clock tower on the site and will overlook properties on my street."</i> <i>"Also the scale of the proposal is out of character for the area"</i> <i>"The six-storey scale of this proposal is also totally out of keeping with the area"</i>	
Housing Need	<i>"The country has a catastrophic housing crisis which is forcing increasing numbers of people to pay such large sums in rent that they are trapped in this cycle. Manchester Council has a growing population and has a great need for new housing, especially rental properties which are not in the city centre."</i> <i>"does not address the housing needs of the area"</i> <i>"The type of housing stock is not appropriate for the areas need of family housing"</i> <i>"We are in desperate need of more housing in the area - rent prices are extortionate and keep going up at a time when all other costs are going up. The cost of housing to buy continues to increase pricing people out of the market. This can only be solved by more housing which we're in desperate need of"</i>	Core Strategy Policy H1 Overall Housing Provision states that approximately 60,000 new dwellings will be provided in Manchester between March 2009 and March 2027. For the South Manchester Regeneration Area, the approximate number of new net dwellings is expected to be 3,420 over the plan period with 90% of residential development being on previously developed land. The policy notes that sites within close proximity to high frequency public transport routes should be prioritised. The Council's Annual Monitoring Reports between 2012-2021 indicate that 34,712 net additional new dwellings are required from 2020 to 2027 to meet policy targets. In South Manchester the number of new net additional dwellings required to be delivered across the remainder of the plan period was 1,308 as of 2021.

		As highlighted in the Appellant's SoC and this PPoE there are acknowledged affordability challenges in South Manchester. Moreover, limited levels of new affordable homes have been delivered in Manchester against both Core Strategy and Residential Growth Strategy targets. It is clear therefore that any contribution toward affordable housing delivery represents a significant benefit. Overall, the proposed development will deliver much needed new rental and affordable homes in the area.
Level of Affordability	<i>"This doesn't fit with the council's aims of making housing affordable to all. Only 15 homes affordable, 80% aren't. What is classed as affordable rent and what are the safeguards against rocketing rents? Could be a large throughput of residents."</i> <i>"They say that this will be affordable housing, but affordable for whom and who sets the level at which they are sold rented"</i> <i>"The apartments proposed do not fit requirements in the area as they are rental and not affordable"</i> <i>"The claim that these flats will be affordable housing is also stupid - it is half a million pounds for a semi detached house in Didsbury. In what world will these flats be affordable"</i>	An Affordable Housing Statement (AHS) was prepared by Deloitte to accompany the planning application and in support of the Proposed Development. The AHS identifies that the proposals include the provision of 20% affordable housing in accordance with the requirements of the adopted policy and guidance (CS policy H8). In addition to the above the proposals also accord with the Built to Rent affordable housing requirements established in the Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 60-002-20180913)
Parking	<i>"Residents don't have adequate parking so the adjacent streets will have the overspill and congestion widens"</i> <i>"Also where will the residents of this proposed block park? There have not been enough parking spaces allocated for them. So are they meant to be parking on nearby residential streets? Well that's not helpful is it?"</i>	The matter of parking provision is no longer in contention between the Appellant and the Council. Parking and travel plan/ management measures are fully addressed in Mr Carl Peer's HPoE and as such are not repeated here.

“unacceptable impact on congestion on highway network. In addition, I contest the developer's assertion that residents of the proposed flats would have few cars between them and would use public transport for their travel needs. Experience has shown that flats of this kind would be occupied largely by car owners who, in addition to leisure use of their cars, would typically use them for travel to work, where public transport is not conveneint, exacerbating the peak-hour congestion at the nearby junction, and their cars would also take up many spaces in the car park, the size of which would have been greatly reduced by the footprint of the proposed new buuilding.!”

“The proposals embrace a design which will encourage a more sustainable living through the absence of car parking spaces. By providing fewer spaces, it will encourage residents who are not reliant on cars and instead use other, more sustainable methods of travel such as bike, bus, tram and train.”

“There is also inadequate parking on the proposed planning for the amount of flats. Pushing residents to park else where such as the train station and surrounding streets adding to the current parking issue in the area.”

“The lack of parking spaces meant to serve the residents of the expected development are not suitable at all. There will likely be a need for a substantial amount of additional parking spaces.”

“the proposed parking seems inadequate for the number of units”

“inadequate on site parking”

“Parking is insufficient [...]Parking on local streets, is available but not ample. Even a small number of additional cars on Parrs Wood Road and Parrs Wood Avenue will significantly impact residents and the 6 businesses on Wilmslow Road”

“Given the cost of living increasing, there is also the fact couples are now living with other couples, meaning a 2 bedroom flats could be routinely housing 4 people. This will increase the likelihood of at least 1 resident per flat owning a car”

“We already have parking issues on the estates and roads from people who use the complex, people who use the school sport fields and people who use the train and tram stations”

“Residents likely to have cars and will park on nearby streets etc. If only 3rd have a car that’s 68 extra cars with only 33 car spaces.”

“Where are all the cars supposed to park for this many flats?”

“here isn’t sufficient parking for residents in that area as it currently stands.”

“lack of parking”

“It does not have required parking spaces for the likely number of occupants.”

“There is not enough room for [...] parking for all the extra cars and its right near a large school”

“This build will result in nearby areas being used as overflow parking by residents as the proposal does not cater for adequate parking. Adding sufficient will result in an already congested junction being overwhelmed.”

“The planned building is still on a scale unsuited to the area with inadequate parking provision for the number of tenants listed. This is a prime example of profit over suitability with little regard for local residents and the site.”

“It will be even more awful for the poor residents of the proposed dwellings trying to park and getting in and out of there homes in rush hour.”

"Insufficient parking is being proposed, which would result in cars being parked in neighbouring streets, many of which already have problems with additional cars being parked"

"The lack of parking availability for residents on the planned residential block is unacceptable and will cause even more traffic in the area"

"[development] is without ample parking which will impact existing local residents."

"This is a major issue, there needs to be a minimum of 1 space per flat as well as extra spaces for visitors, postmen, taxis, delivery drivers etc. The lack of parking will negatively impact surrounding houses as the residents will end up parking on neighbouring roads"

"Even if there were, parking round there for residents of citypeak (building across the road from the two junctions) and the nearby suburban roads is already horrendous, limiting access to the station. I'm amazed a plan like this is even being put forward, it is so utterly unacceptable."

"Comments made previously that there will only be a few parking spaces so people living there will not have cars are just naive! They will & will park in the already congested streets locally. It will also add to the pollution which much already be huge at that corner. A totally unsuitable site."

"Inadequate access and lack of provision for parking make this proposal unacceptable"

"Also the residents parking is inadequate. In theory it is a site where public transport is excellent (bus, tram and train) but it will only be a matter of time before they need to take more of the supermarket parking space"

"The other concern is that if only one in three flats have access to a parking space, where will the other two thirds of residents park as east Didsbury is populated with professionals with a requirement to drive as part of their employment."

"I don't have space for my guests who come to visit me on the Avenue as other people are parking there. There is very little parking for people who leave their cars using the railways and so the surrounding areas used by people to park already"

"With the number of residential units proposed and the small number of car parking places allocated this will only add to existing parking issues for local residents on neighbouring streets also increasing the likelihood of accidents. In addition to these concerns about the impact on traffic congestion and road traffic accidents"

"I note the plans also do not include adequate parking"

"Does not meet planning requirements of 100% parking provision for out of city centre and district developments. Parking is only 44% not 48% as stated in the submission"

"It does not provide enough parking spaces for the number of apartments proposed and there is a real danger of the local streets being affected by overspill parking. They are already busy streets due to the tram stop car park getting full and due to local businesses."

"I understand there is an inadequate number of parking spaces proposed for this development which will mean apartment owners having to find street parking nearby. We already experience issues of people parking along the road outside Citi peak complex running up to the train station, and quite often parking up to the traffic light meaning if you want to exit you have to sit on the opposite side of the road waiting for the lights to change. This is extremely dangerous"

"Members of the public overspill from Tesco and the tram car park during the week leaving people to park as they wish."

"The proposed onsite parking is clearly inadequate and will lead to anti-social / illegal parking in and around the site."

“Residents are likely to have cars and will park on nearby streets as there are insufficient parking spaces provided for a development of this size. If only a third have a car that’s 68 extra cars with only 33 car spaces. They are likely to park on side streets such as my avenue which is already congested with cars from couriers for the various takeaways and other people using the railway station and local businesses”

“There aren’t enough car parking spaces for the flats - the developers can’t control who has 1 or more cars living there. It means side roads (already used for train parking) get even more congested leading to drivers racing up 20 mph roads like ours.”

“Dandara still have not provided enough parking spaces.”

“Parking provision associated with the development is wholly inadequate.”

“My main concern is parking. The roads surrounding roads ie Parrs Wood Rd, Parrs Wood Avenue are full each day with cars parking. It is not people living there, it seems to be people going for tram/train. I do know that a person left car there going to airport on holiday. I believe there are only so many car parking spaces being allowed on this site”

“The are insufficient parking places for the number of dwellings. This is cited as an issue in the original refusal. All nearby similar buildings have sufficient parking for all flats. Parking will spread to neighbouring streets. Local tram, train and bus networks are close by but routes are limited to city centre destinations. A car is needed to access areas to the south.”

“Residents are also very worried the proposal only includes 36 car parking spaces. Put simply the proposal does not provide an adequate level of on-site car parking to serve the development. As residents who live within a two-minute walking from the site, we’re extremely concerned what this could mean for on-street parking near us. A further increase in vehicles using our road poses a risk, including potentially restricting access for emergency vehicles.”

	<i>“The level of proposed parking in the planning application is totally inadequate and would add to the already existing parking problems in the area and on surrounding residential roads including Parrs Wood Ave, particularly as Tesco car park has restricted car parking. Any increase in vehicles on nearby Aves, Roads and Streets within the imminent area poses a real risk, including potentially restricting access for emergency vehicles. The provision does also not accord with local new developments of a similar scale which all offer over 100% parking provision.”</i>	
Traffic	<i>“The site is highly sustainable, with easy access to bus, tram and rail links to major employment centres in Manchester and the rest of the city region. It is located on a brownfield plot, an under-utilised supermarket car park, and would allow a better use of the land.”</i> <i>“The junction here is very busy and the traffic is already a significant issue. Adding additional traffic and the inadequate parking will only make this worse for residents.”</i> <i>“Overcrowded in terms of traffic passing in the vicinity of Tesco.”</i> <i>“This site is on a complex road junction with the major road A34 Kingsway having the main right of way. It’s one of the busiest road junctions in South Manchester; as a result all surrounding roads to/from Didsbury/Stockport and Cheadle are already totally blocked during rush hours. Building a high-density development like this would have an unacceptable impact on the highway network around the vicinity of the site. We have grave concerns not only about the impact of resident traffic but the amount of Delivery vehicles and visitors to a 200+ residents building. Pedestrian and highway safety at the junctions local to the site are already a major concern to many and any extra traffic would lead to even more dangerous levels than already experienced.”</i> <i>“Traffic is biggest concern both during the build and after”</i> <i>“The junction here is already heavily congested and I need to pass through when exiting the village daily for work and often at the week too. Further traffic and congestion will negatively impact the area.”</i>	The matter of impacts on the highway network is no longer in contention between the Appellant and the Council. All highways matters are fully addressed in Mr Carl Peer’s HPoE and as such are not repeated here.

"The Parrs Wood Tesco junction is a very busy and sometime gridlocked junction at numerous times of the day, and especially bad in mornings and between 4pm and 6.30pm"

"More cars means more traffic. The Parrs Wood Lane section of the local road system is the most congested, locally. This development and the building of will add to this. Even now the timing of pedestrian crossings mean that cars regularly drive through a green man on both Parrs Wood Lane crossing (coming from Wilmslow Road, East) and Wilmslow Road crossing (coming from Parrs Wood Road, South). More traffic will exacerbate this. This is a main route for children walking to Parrs Wood High School."

"It will make the whole busy junction far too crowded and congested as well as making the open aspect of that corner too enclosed."

"I have a concern about this application because of the increased traffic in an area that is already a significant bottleneck to traffic flow."

"With residents who may all have cars this will vastly multiply the congestion at a tight junction. Which is already a troubled choke point for traffic!"

"the Parrs wood junction especially at rush hour is jammed enough, this planned development would only make traffic much worse. A separate entrance to the proposed flats is unfeasible and using the current Tesco entrance would block the junction up further."

"The area already suffers from congestion, especially at the junction of Kingsway and Wilmslow Road/Didsbury Road. This could become dangerous with the additional traffic that would be created by such a large housing development"

" Finally, this is an extremely busy, congested junction already and extra traffic without good cause is not what I think we need in the local area."

"The impact on traffic at the junction out on to the main road along with nearby junctions. That section of road is a complete nightmare at the best of times, in particular during rush hour traffic. I have been witness to a number of road incidents where drivers have been dangerously weaving in and out of traffic and going through red lights etc due to the long delays at these times"

"The traffic survey was carried out in Sept 2021 when still in lockdown with many people WFH so not a true assessment. Traffic is absolute gridlock on all three major roads backing up Kingsway, Didsbury Road and into Didsbury at peak times and busy at non-peak times. Also the bus routes will be more congested and even slower. This development will make things worse."

"as this junction is already highly congested I feel it will become absolutely horrendous. I travel across this junction everyday and at rush hour it's terrible."

"The junction itself is busy and doesn't cater for the traffic flow it currently caters to."

"I use this junction and the transport links every day and often see near miss accidents. This really is a dangerous junction particularly for school children at the two local large high schools. I think any extra traffic at this site would have a severe affect on pedestrian safety."

"too much traffic. The road is already very congested."

"The most frustrating thing though is that this type of residential dwelling close to already congested and polluting roads will only further enhance this problem to the detriment of current residents in the surrounding area and new residents in the development, metres from one of the main artery roads into Manchester City centre."

"- The junction directly outside of this development is already over congested, poorly maintained and can cause risk already in its current form. Adding additional strain to this by development does

not really account for this in any meaningful way bar an argument it would barely add to the current issues.

Overall I do not feel that this development actually addresses the real issues and concerns for good, decent and suitable housing other than the basic offering of residential units with a small additional extras but at additional cost etc.”

“The junction located from Paris Wood Lane into tesco is always congested as it is, the residents who will occupy these flats the majority will have cars and this junction will only get worse.”

“Congestion at the junction is already excessive with supermarket, school, gym, cinema, train station and restaurants.”

“The most important one is the impact that it will inevitably have on traffic congestion. The section of Wilmslow road that passes Tescos and leads to Kingsway is always busy and at key times of day (morning commute time, school collection time and weekends when both the Nuffield Health Centre and the multi- cinema complex are used to maximum capacity) the already existing congestion will be significantly increased with concomitant risk of accidents. Cars entering and leaving Tescos car park will also be affected. In addition the fact that, were this development to go ahead, this traffic increase would be happening in close proximity to a large secondary school not increases the potential for accidents.”

“Parrswood is a busy junction with no on street parking.”

“The inevitable parking overspill would be a significant problem to those who live nearby and undoubtedly people will not be able to get parked outside of their own home and children will be dodging even more cars to get to school.”

“This building will cause chaos at the junction which is already clogged with traffic creating a dangerous situation for school children crossing the road to access Tesco and to other pedestrians.”

“the traffic situation is awful already. This is a completely overwhelming junction”

"I consider the potential increase in the number of vehicles will exasperate the already high levels of traffic congestion."

"The development has not considered the impact on traffic nor the potential increase number of vehicles attempting to ingress or egress from the development, the development lacks details on traffic management and impact on the locality."

"this development will result in marked worsening of traffic conditions and local air quality. It is imperative that environmental concerns and the pollution resulting from increased static traffic are prioritised in keeping with legal requirements and to protect the health of children at the neighbouring school as well as local residents."

"This is a very busy junction, with frequent traffic jams at certain times of day. The proposed development would exacerbate this issue. It is close to two secondary schools, which have well over two thousand students between them. The volume of traffic at school start and finish times is already high, the increased amount would increase the risk to students of being involved in accidents."

"Traffic is already so congested at this junction and this would only exacerbate it"

"I believe this development will create more congestion at an already busy traffic area having a negative affect on Tesco Parrs Wood shoppers and anyone living in the area."

"residential development on this land would add traffic to an already over congested junction."

"Increased pedestrian traffic will pose health and safety risks without installation of adequate crossing infrastructure which will also negatively impact the congestion and air quality"

"The junction regularly has accidents and near misses. As a cyclist, it is treacherous. school children run across and it is only a matter of time until a serious accident there"

"The traffic situation at that corner is already dangerous, heavy & chaotic, especially at rush hour periods but heavy at virtually all times of the day. To build any kind of property on this site will only make it worse"

"The increased congestion will make it even more dangerous for them to cross the road in this area. There has not been enough parking given for the residents. This means there is likely to be overspill into the surrounding roads, which is highly undesirable for local people"

"I object to the building of the apartment block on this land on the basis of the negative impact it will have on traffic in Didsbury."

"This development would be detrimental to the area, especially when it comes to the increased traffic and parking problems that it most certainly would bring."

"The site is adjacent to a very busy junction which is not trouble free now"

"The traffic already at rush hour there is horrendous. With so many cars and so many sets of lights in such a small space. Lights changing from green to red and no one moving already. The extra residents will only make this worse. With me living so close to this development it will effect my daily commute"

"The traffic is horrendous at that junction as it is without the additional cars that this development will bring into play"

"The junction of the A34/ parrs wood road is severely congested and a further residential building with 68 vehicles would add further to the issues. It has been noted that emergency vehicles have experienced delays in getting through traffic on this stretch of road past Tesco East Didsbury."

“Additional living spaces means additional cars using the roads and causing jams and congestion”

“please can consideration be made to road improvements that support children and other pedestrians to safely cross the road”

“My overriding concern is based on the likely impact on traffic and accidents in the area. The junction of A34 Kingsway with Parrswood Lane is already an extremely busy and dangerous one”

“The traffic in this area is particularly bad already, this would further compound an extremely serious problem which in itself needs rectified given the volume of children who use the route to commute to school.”

“There is already a lot of traffic and not enough access in this area. The junction is always busy and has a high number of pedestrians. The roads are also in bad condition in the surrounding area and additional traffic will not help with this.”

“Impact on traffic congestion at the adjacent complex junctions”

“That number of additional residents is going to have a significant impact on traffic in the area. It is an extremely busy junction. It’s near 2 motorway junctions and main A roads. It’s near several schools and is a busy commuter route. Any additional activity is going to impact the community further. The junction is often very snarled up”

“It is at the heart of congestion spot for traffic and already causes problems for motorists, both those using Tesco to shop and those using the junction to get elsewhere”

“I, like many other local residents, are against this development due to the additional traffic, parking issues and congestion it will bring to the area. It is already an extremely busy junction and quite often residents leaving the Citi Peak complex, which is also the access road to the East Didsbury

train station, have to sit through the traffic lights changing red to green back to red again as other road users block the road at the junction. At peak times this is even worse. The addition of another apartment block in the Tesco car park will only bring more traffic to this junction”

“This development will add at least 70 additional cars to a junction that is already too congested. It is not appropriate to have flats on a supermarket car park Congestion and additional traffic in Didsbury need to be avoided for health and safety and environmental reasons. There will be additional danger to pedestrians crossing at the junction not to mention the noise and pollution.”

“Parrs wood is an already overly busy junction. Traffic build up and pollution is high and frustrating for residents already in the area. People park up dangerously to drop/pick up children for the secondary school there - more congestion, pollution and road rage is not what the area needs.”

“I believe this development is not suitable for this location and will compound the vehicular traffic issues at the Parrs Wood junction.”

“The build up of traffic in the area is bad enough as it is. The junction is Parrs wood road, Parrs Wood Lane and kingsway is constantly congested. The addition of residential appartments will only add to this. It will cause chaos at all times of the day not just at rush hour times.”

“the basis that the increase in vehicles regularly accessing the site will hugely impact an already busy traffic interchange”

“I object to this development at an already very congested junction servicing a major road, but route and large supermarket, all proximate to a rail station and residential properties. Very residences (this property development) will only increase the traffic congestion at this site.”

“Adding even more cars here leads to driver frustration (meaning they drive stupidly at times) and more car fumes (environmental issues)”

"The junction adjacent to this development is already congested and dysfunctional. On turning left from Wilmslow Road towards the supermarket it is not uncommon to find a queue of traffic backed up from the junction with the A34. When trying to leave the supermarket turning right towards Didsbury is also often fraught. The addition of further traffic from the new residential development without significant changes to the flow and control of traffic around this junction will cause additional congestion and will be to the detriment of road users in Didsbury. It simply cannot take additional traffic in its current state."

"During the hours of 3pm to 6pm that area due to the way the lights are set out that splits Wilmslow Road to didsbury road. It's already chaos at these times with congestion due to schools, work finish times and people going into Tesco"

"That area already suffers horrendously at peak time for traffic in and out of Manchester"

"above this will involve even more traffic and jams at the Tesco entrance exist. If anyone has ever been to the Tesco and witnessed the chaos at time at that junction you will know this proposal will put unmanageable pressure on traffic resulting in local residents suffering from delays and pollution, the environment will be impacted as well as quality and enjoyment of life for the local residents."

"Living on the junction, it is already impossible some days to get over Wilmslow Road due to the traffic congestion. To add another 200 apartments, most people have cars is exacerbating an already unacceptable level of congestion. Surely the lane can be put to some good use, that won't impact the traffic"

"This is an extremely busy area - regularly very heavily congested. It is a commuter traffic bottleneck, as well as attracting heavy traffic for the supermarket, nearby train/Metrolink stations, leisure complex and schools"

"Historically Parrswood lane, particularly during rush hour is highly congested both ways; this impacts all adjacent roads namely Wilmslow Road, Parrswood Lane, Didsbury Road & Kingsway"

	<i>causing severe congestion and gridlock. To increase the number of vehicles using these roads would greatly impact on the environment and the health, safety & wellbeing of pedestrians and motorists alike."</i> <i>"This is a development in a very busy and tight road junction that has always been over-congested. This development as planned will make it dangerously unworkable, leading to congestion across the very busy Kingsway into and out of Manchester, and completely clogging back into Stockport and Didsbury."</i> <i>"it will increase traffic, it offers insufficient parking for the number of flats and residents, furthermore the design is not in keeping with the aesthetics of the area, is inconsiderate to the natural surrounds in both scale and height"</i> <i>"traffic congestion is a major problem at the Parr's Wood junction. It's one of the busiest road junctions in South Manchester. At rush hour there are already tail backs on Wilmslow Road and along Didsbury Road. Building a high-density development like this would have an unacceptable impact on the highway network around the vicinity of the site. Pedestrian and highway safety at the junctions local to the site are also a real concern too"</i>	
Access to Local Services	<i>"what thought has been given to the area's infrastructure I.e access to Drs, Dentists; already with the number of developments within Didsbury the infrastructure is already stretched to breaking point. If Tesco want the space to be utilised usefully then why not have a Drs, a Dentist or some other health care clinic to provide a service that would benefit all and not just a developer who has paid scant attention to the requirements of the area and location."</i> <i>"What provisioning increase is being considered for dealing with the increased demand on GP capacity which is already stretched beyond capacity. There is a real problem with this in the area."</i> <i>"The amenities here are stretched as it is with regard to GP surgeries, schools and dentists"</i>	In determining the planning application the LPA had due to regard to CS policy PA1 and the local need for contributions toward health and wellbeing facilities. No planning obligations were sought in respect of the scheme proposals.

	<i>"We already struggle locally with doctor and dentists, there is nothing to show how the local infrastructure will cope with a further few hundred people living locally. More surgeries and dental surgeries? More schools?"</i> <i>"Concerned regarding [...], the increase pressure on local services - doctors schools etc"</i>	
Refuse Provision	<i>"Bin provision unlikely adequate and will cause more rubbish in Tesco car park and nearby which is already pretty bad."</i>	The proposed development includes a policy compliant level of refuse storage. A Residential Management Plan was prepared by Dandara in support of the planning application stating that the on site management team will be responsible for rotating full bins and replacing them with empty, clean bins for resident use. The on-site team will also take waste from the amenity spaces and the amenity space and place it in the appropriate containers in the refuse store.
Biodiversity Net Gain	<i>"No net gain in biodiversity"</i>	The existing site comprises an area of hardstanding in use as a surface level car park. Due to the nature of the existing use, the existing biodiversity value of the site is considered to be low. New landscaping will be introduced as part of the scheme. Currently the Council has no policy requiring biodiversity net gain with the provisions of the Environment Act 2021 requiring a 10% uplift not coming into force until November 2023.
BtR Demographic	<i>"In addition, it is creating a population density that will harm the demographics of Didsbury"</i>	All of the new homes will be available to rent on long term assured tenancies and managed by Dandara Living, of which 20% will be offered at affordable rent. The layout mix provides a range of apartments, which offer accommodation for rent to contribute towards meeting the ongoing residential demand in Didsbury and the surrounding areas.

Building Safety Pledge	<i>"Dandara have refused to sign the Building Safety Pledge which aims to ensure safer buildings."</i>	Dandara committed to the Building Safety Pledge on 2 nd March 2023.
Clock Tower	<i>"It will dwarf the iconic Tesco clock tower."</i> <i>"It's taller than the historic clock tower on the site which many call 'the gateway to Didsbury' and would overshadow this and the much loved park opposite."</i> <i>"dwarfing the local landmark of the clock tower and the small park opposite."</i> <i>"it would dwarf the clock tower and junction"</i> <i>"In addition to obscuring pedestrian and driver's views it will also obscure a well known and valued local heritage landmark, the old clock tower of the former bus station on the site of the current Tesco car park."</i> <i>"It dwarfs the clock tower which is an iconic landmark in our community"</i> <i>"I would be dismayed to see the old bus depot clock, long since a landmark, being overshadowed out of all proportion by this development also. I urge the committee to reject this proposal"</i> <i>"The clock tower is an important historical landmark in our community. It has acted a gateway into our city for many years and is a monument to the suburban and transportation development of south Manchester. Sadly, it will be obscured and dwarfed by the scale of this development"</i> <i>"furthermore it will dominate the space currently occupied by the iconic 1930's clock tower which is an aesthetically pleasing and well-loved feature of the neighbourhood."</i> <i>"I would like to add that building such a tall development will for lots of residents obscure the view of the clock tower which is an iconic landmark for local residents."</i>	<i>Although it will be evident that none of the RfR specifically relate to the historic built environment or heritage impact, a number of comments have been received in respect of the clock tower. As such, the Appellant instructed Stephen Levrant Heritage Architecture to prepare a supporting heritage note to assess the relative significance of the clock tower and its heritage status (Appendix D).</i> <i>The heritage note concludes that:</i> <i>"Although it will be evident the Appeal scheme will result in some visual change to the composition of the townscape, the clocktower will continue to be appreciable in key vistas looking south along Kingsway. In accordance with the unidentified heritage status of the early 20th century structure, the setting of the clocktower should be also afforded limited material weight.</i> <i>The Appeal scheme will not incur any long-term, physical impact (or total loss) of the clocktower and despite the scale of the proposals, would not have a highly detrimental impact upon its setting.</i> <i>To conclude, the historic interest of the clocktower will remain unaffected by the Appeal scheme and due to the structure yielding limited identified status, the</i>

		<i>overarching impact on the built historic environment will be negligible</i>
Construction Phase Impact	<i>“Building the development will cause a massive disruption to the already busy area, with noise, air pollution, dust, vibration, water quality, extra rubbish and waste, heavy vehicles entering/exiting the site and also impact Tesco shoppers.”</i> <i>“Concerns in air quality assessment to residents, particularly during construction phase”</i> <i>“The Building works will have major disruption on the local community and its well-being”</i> <i>“during the construction process (at least 18 months and beyond), there would be a significant increase in large vehicles which would add to the already congested junction and create an extremely unsafe space for children accessing the 2 local schools.”</i>	To ensure any environmental impacts as a result of the proposed development are minimised, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been prepared by the Dandara Living. Construction environmental impacts will be monitored and minimised through contractor compliance with the CEMP, including through responsible construction management practices; implementation of pollution prevention policies; monitoring construction Site energy and water consumption; and implementation of a sustainable procurement plan to ensure key materials are as responsibly sourced as possible.
Crime	<i>“Crime could potentially increase as a result of another development next to a supermarket”</i>	A Crime Impact Statement was prepared by Greater Manchester Police noted that a positive impact of the proposed development will be that it increases residential activity in this area which can deter criminality and antisocial behaviour.
Flooding and Drainage	<i>“Flooding has been a big problem in the last two years and right adjacent to this high risk flood region. Will increase standing water in this area”</i> <i>“There has been a lot of building of houses etc on Wilmslow Rd over the last couple of years and every time it rains the drains cannot cope. There are puddles on the roads in particular Wilmslow Rd and if you walk on the pavement you get wet with the cars passing”</i>	A Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy was prepared by Apex Consulting concluded that, with regard to drainage and consequential flood risk, the site is suitable for the proposed use. Subject to the implementation of this Drainage Strategy, the development may be occupied safely and adequately drained while reducing flood risk overall.
Ground Floor Design	<i>“Wasted space for ?amenities on the ground floor”</i>	The proposed development includes a flexible ground floor space that is ancillary to the residential use but will also be available for use by the local community, is provided at the ground floor.

Pollution (air & noise) and Contamination	<i>“There will be more noise and air pollution as a result of this development.”</i> <i>“Identified asbestos in the ground from the former bus depot which is a hazard.”</i> <i>“Pollution is also a concern”</i> <i>“The level of air pollution in this area is high. Increased traffic would obviously raise this level. This would have an impact on local residents, and students travelling to and from school”</i> <i>“Increased vehicular traffic will add to congestion and result in increased car emissions negatively impacting the air quality. Worse air quality will effect the health and wellbeing of the public and local wildlife as well as impacting climate change. Worse air quality will effect the health and wellbeing of the public and local wildlife as well as impacting climate change.”</i> <i>“It is not a suitable place to build dwellings as the air pollution from the already excessive traffic is horrendous”</i> <i>“There is already a lot of pollution with so much traffic using that junction this will cause additional Pollution. So the parking issue is a big one but is not the main issue the traffic the congestion the safety the pollution all these have to be taken into consideration”</i> <i>“Concerned regarding [...]The environmental impact - air quality.”</i>	<u>Air Quality</u> An Air Quality Assessment has been conducted for the Proposed Development. The Air Quality Assessment identifies that during the construction phase of the development there is the potential for air quality impacts as a result of fugitive dust emissions from the Site. Assuming good practice dust control measures are implemented, the residual significance of potential air quality impacts from dust generated by earthworks, construction and trackout activities was predicted to be not significant. The proposed development has the potential to expose future residents to elevated pollution levels and impact existing air quality in the vicinity of the site during operation. Review of the dispersion modelling results indicate that impacts on air quality measurements as a result of traffic generated by the development were predicted to be negligible at all sensitive receptor locations. The site is therefore considered suitable for the proposed use from an air quality perspective. <u>Noise</u> The impact of the development during operation in relation to noise considers that there will be no impact to existing residential properties. The likely sources of noise are considered to be operational plant for heating and cooling and any vehicle movements. However, these are not considered to be noticeable on the basis of the background noise levels at the site. Full details
--	---	---

		are included within the Noise Impact Assessment prepared by E3P in support of the application. The construction phase, which will be temporary in nature, is managed through the principles set out in the Construction Management Plan prepared by Dandara Living Limited. The control of noise and vibration will be in line with BS5228: Control of Noise and Vibration during construction phase, and the detailed construction management plan will be prepared and submitted to the Council by way of planning condition, subject to planning approval. It is considered that noise and vibration impact during the construction period can be sufficiently mitigated.
Television Survey	<i>“Television survey - high aerials possible if reception isn’t good enough”</i>	A Television Baseline Survey Report was prepared by Pager Power to accompany the planning application noting that any reported television interference after construction has begun should be investigated by means of a reception measurement.
Tesco Car Parking	<i>“That part of the Tesco car park is used and often has cars in it. It is used less than other areas because it is further away from the store but it is still, nevertheless, needed for shoppers”</i> <i>“Not enough car spaces so Tesco car park will be full up, which is already pretty full at peak times. People will park on nearby roads of other residents if Tesco impose a car park time limit and if not car park will be permanently full. They went against the planning consultation recommending 100% parking provision. Would this mean more space taken from Tesco car park? This is also against the council’s aims for sustainability.”</i> <i>“Tesco’s car park gets full up now you want to build something that takes away a lot of the spaces and have a load more people come in all with a car so where will they all park ?”</i>	Tesco continues to invest in the East Didsbury superstore and they recognise it provides an important range of services to the local community. Tesco’s car parking analysis has shown that there are surplus parking spaces for this store and they are working with Dandara to deliver a residential use for this part of the site and have provided a letter of support for the appeal. If the appeal is granted, the store will continue to trade throughout the construction period and any disruption to customers will be minimal.

	<i>“The reduced supermarket car park is likely to cause gridlock at peak shopping times and that will impact on the traffic nearby.”</i> <i>“The car park to Tesco East Didsbury is also very limited on parking space and often relies on the additional parking area in which these apartments will be built up on.”</i> <i>“Tesco parking is likely to fall victim to the volume of residents. 68 cars to 205 residents is completely unrealistic given the price of the area surely a higher volume of residents will be making use of tesco car park and causing congestion. Please can you ensure that proper independant usage data modelling is carried out to ensure that the case is well informed.”</i>	Tesco regularly reviews its car park operations to ensure that they best meet the requirements of its customers and they do not have any plans to change the current car parking management regime at this store. The current arrangement provides customers with a two hour maximum stay or a 15 minute maximum stay outside of store opening hours.
--	---	--

Appendix B - Design Response

Statement prepared by Mr Stephen Hodder



Appeal Statement

Blackbird Yard,
Land Junction of Parrs Wood Lane,
Manchester

Prepared by

Stephen R Hodder MBE
BA(Hons), BArch(Dist) DArts PPRIBA Hon AIA FRSA
Hodder + Partners

architects+designers

SGI Studios
1 Kelso Place
Manchester M15 4LE
t: +44 (0)161 832 9842
e: mail@hodderandpartners.com
w: www.hodderandpartners.com

hodder+partners

Contents

1.0	Qualifications and Experience	4
2.0	Introduction	4
3.0	Context	5
3.1	Site Location	5
3.2	Site Description	5
3.3	Environmental and Site Factors	5
3.4	Existing Building Heights	5
3.5	Existing Site Movement and Public Transport	5
4.0	Design Response	6
4.1	Use	6
4.2	Amount	6
4.3	Site layout	6
4.4	Massing Development	6
4.5	Height + Scale	6
4.6	Materiality and Context	7
5.0	Summary	7

1.0 Qualifications and Experience

My name is Stephen Hodder and I am the founding director of Hodder+Partners, architects. I was educated at the School of Architecture, University of Manchester, where I gained a Distinction in the Bachelor of Architecture degree. Following University, I joined Building Design Partnership in 1981 and became a member of the Royal Institute of British Architects in 1982.

I have been in practice since 1983 and in 1992 formed Hodder Associates which won the Royal Fine Art Commission/ Sunday Times Building of the Year Award for Colne Swimming Pool in Lancashire later that year.

In 1996 Hodder Associates, now Hodder+Partners, received the most important award in British Architecture for a single building, the inaugural RIBA Stirling Prize for Architecture for the Centenary Building, University of Salford. The Practice has now won over sixty major awards, including twelve awards for the Welcome Building at RHS Garden Bridgewater.

I regularly act as an assessor for architectural competitions and awards, most recently for the RAIC International Prize and sits on the Design Review Panel for Places Matter!

I was appointed MBE for services to architecture in the Queen's Birthday Honours List, 1998.

I received an honorary doctorate in 2006 from the Manchester Metropolitan University for my regional, national and international contribution to architecture and a honorary fellowship from the University of Central Lancashire in 2013 and won the Roses Design Award of 'Architect of the Year' in the same year.

I have written and lectured widely, have been a visiting examiner at a number of schools of architecture and visiting Professor at the Birmingham School of Architecture, the Belfast School of Architecture and the University of Salford, School of the Built Environment. I am currently Professor of Architecture at the Manchester School of Architecture.

I was RIBA President 2013-15, having previously been Vice President Membership, Nations and Regions and Chair of the Construction Industry Council 2019-2021.

I am very familiar with the site having been appointed by Dandara Living at the beginning of 2020.

2.0 Introduction

I have been asked to comment on our design approach for the proposed development.

At the beginning of 2020, the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission published its final report 'Living with Beauty' advising government on how to promote and increase the use of high-quality design for new build homes and neighbourhoods. It states;

'We do not see beauty as a cost, to be negotiated away once planning permission has been obtained. It is the benchmark that all new developments should meet. It includes everything that promotes a healthy and happy life, everything that makes a collection of buildings into a place, everything that turns anywhere into somewhere, and nowhere into home.'

Hodder+Partners was commended as only one of three practices in the 'Building Category' in the Royal Fine Art Commission Trust's Building Beauty Awards 2022. It is our belief that our revised proposal for Blackbird Yard seeks to sustain the quality of our work as recognised by the Trust. It is consistent with the aim of the Government's agenda of seeking 'beauty' as defined above, and the Design and Access Statement that accompanied the planning application is robust.

3.0 Context

3.1 Site Location

The site is located to the South of Tesco Superstore in East Didsbury and opposite Parrs Wood entertainment centre and a Travelodge.

The site is bounded by Kingsway to the East, Parrs Wood Lane to the South and Tesco car park to the North and West.

3.2 Site Description

The existing site is occupied by a small portion (2,445sq.m.) of Tesco car park.

To the north of the site, across a further stretch of car park, is Tesco Superstore. On the other side of Kingsway is the East Didsbury Metrolink stop.

To the east, on the other side of Kingsway, is the Travelodge and Parrs Wood Entertainment centre.

To the south, on the other side of Parrs Wood Road, is a park that occupies the space between three highway junctions, and further residential blocks.

The railway sits to the west of the site, with East Didsbury Station located a short distance South.

A clock tower, retained from a historic bus depot, is located adjacent to, but outside of, the site boundary to the east. This is currently used as Tesco signage.

3.3 Environmental and Site Factors

The site is bounded by roads on all sides apart from the North where Tesco's car park abuts the site boundary. The road to the West of the site boundary is the main access road into the Tesco car park and provides access to the site. Kingsway to the East and Parrs Wood Lane to the South are part of the surrounding highways network.

To the South of the site is Parrs Wood Entertainment centre, a Travelodge, and a series of residential blocks that dominate the area in scale at 5-6 storeys high. The Railway to the West sets a clear boundary between these higher storey elements and the lower density residential area of East Didsbury.

There is currently no pedestrian access across the site, with a retaining brick wall and fence separating the car park from Kingsway and Parrs Wood Lane.

Adjacent to the site to the South is a park between the main roads, which houses many large trees. There is also an existing tree just outside of the site boundary on Parrs Wood Lane.

3.4 Existing Building Heights

The current site is part of the car parking for Tesco, located North of the site at 3 storeys.

To the South and East of the site are a number of buildings with more height, including the large Parrs Wood Entertainment Centre reaching approximately 6 residential storeys, and a number of residential blocks at 5/6 storeys.

To the West, all buildings are separated by the railway embankment, and are predominantly residential and 2 storeys high.

The site to the East is a flat park and ride for the Metrolink.

3.5 Existing Site Movement and Public Transport

Pedestrian access to public transport is abundant around the site, including routes to the East Didsbury Railway Station to the West, East Didsbury Metrolink to the North East, and a primary bus route along Kingsway. It is anticipated that residents will make use of these sustainable transport links and avoid using the existing road network.

4.0 Design Response

4.1 Use

The scheme proposes the following uses:

Residential (Class C3)

4.2 Amount

The proposal is for a residential block with a total of 75 dwellings, consisting of 25 one bedroom (33.4%), 40 two bedroom (53.3%), and 10 three bedroom (13.4%).

The ground floor houses generous entrance and concierge areas alongside 114 sq.m. of flexible community space. The site topography allows for car parking, bin storage, cycle storage and plant spaces to be located on ground floor, but hidden from sight along Kingsway and Parrs Wood Lane. The first floor on the south of the site contains apartments with raised terraces providing pleasant garden wall frontage to the south. The design accommodates 36 parking spaces (48%) and secure cycle storage at a ratio of 1:1.

The total GIA for the site, including plant and bin stores but excluding car parking and external substation, is: 6,123sq.m.

4.3 Site layout

The proposals respond to the adjacent roads with defined edges whilst providing green landscaped frontage to Parrs Wood Lane and private outdoor amenity spaces for residents, car parking, servicing and landscaped public realm.

The building orientation leads to two key entrances, firstly from the crossing over Tesco car park entrance at the south point of the building, which utilises a direct pedestrian route from train and bus stops, and secondly from the internal corner of the building, where residents may park, be dropped off, or move to and from Tesco.

The South entrance also acts as the community space entrance, leading to the ground floor flexible community room, creating an active frontage onto the corner of Parrs Wood Lane and Tesco car park entrance.

Private terraces line the edge of the south facing apartments on the first floor. These are raised to create privacy for residents, yet provide a garden wall character frontage to the street adjacent.

The clock tower is retained to the east of the site, with new landscaping provided to enhance the setting.

Landscaping is provided throughout the ground floor and terraces, with the introduction of trees, planting and native hedgerows enhancing the biodiversity on site.

4.4 Massing Development

The building footprint highlights the corner of the highways, and reflects that of the historic urban grain of the Parrs Wood Bus Depot. The footprint is pushed away from Tesco Car Park to form an L shape, to allow for access and servicing within the site boundary.

Massing is influenced by the surrounding urban context. The first iteration proposed a 7 storey building which, given the generous space around, we believed appropriate to the context. Following consultations and discussions with Ward Councillors, the proposals were reduced to 6 storeys in response to the adjacent Citipeaks apartment building which is also 6 storeys in height.

To break the massing along the streetscape, articulated slots and corner are introduced. The massing is further broken up by the 5th floor lightweight articulated boxes, reducing the apparent height of the building.

The site is then integrated into the directly adjacent landscape through garden walled terraces, planting of landscape buffers and introduction of new trees to soften the streetscape.

4.5 Height + Scale

The height, scale and massing of the proposals have been directly influenced by the surrounding context in Parrs Wood.

The relative 5 storey height (due to level change from Kingsway) of the proposed building sits at a similar height to Parrs Wood Court, Citipeak Apartments, Travelodge, and Parrs Wood Entertainment Centre.

The roofscape is articulated through bronze coloured metal boxes to the 5th floor facade, to reduce the height appearance. On the south west corner the brickwork is raised further above the central dwelling in a box form. This arrangement creates a focal point at the corner of Tesco car park entrance and creates a dramatic roofscape.

The height does not interrupt the 25° sky view line from 1m on Parrs Wood Avenue, or from the Citipeaks apartments, the two closest residences, therefore there is minimal overlooking and a negligible change to daylight.

4.6 Materiality and Context

The proposal seeks to create an architectural expression which draws from the history of the site whilst providing a contemporary elevational treatment to suit the emerging context to the east of the railway embankment.

This area has no defined architectural style, therefore we have drawn upon the industrial transportation history of the site with brick as the main material, as well as the modern context of lightweight cladding seen on Parrs Wood Entertainment Centre.

The site has a rich history of advancing public transport for the area, including the previous bus depot that was housed on the site, as well as the historic railway embankment adjacent to the site, where Didsbury railway station opened in 1880. In more recent years this has expanded further with the metrolink.

Directly adjacent to the site is the railway embankment, this marks a key dividing point in the character of area, separating the low rise residential area from the larger scale developments to the east. We have taken elements from this key feature to tie the expression and materiality of the building to the context.

The bridge crossing over Wilmslow Road features a dark brick retaining wall along the embankment, grounding the bridge and the embankment, the bridge itself is then seen as a lightweight metal structure with elements of articulated detail as well as strong horizontals creating a cornice line to the upper portion.

This strategy has informed the proposals through the use of grey brick to the lower storeys to ground the structure and a lightweight metal top with subtle detail and a strong cornice line. The proportions of rectangular details on the bridge have also informed the design in breaking down the mass of the elevations both along the length as well as vertically.

This breaking up of the mass in to regular, repeating elements along the street, with a strong cornice, can also be seen in the facade of the historic bus depot.

The facade treatment can be split in to three zones, the lower floor terraces and entrances, allowing the landscape and public realm to integrate with the building. The brick townhouse forms, punctuated by grey metal balconies, grey metal window reveals and bronze coloured metal panels. And the top providing a lighter and distinct roofscape articulated through bronze coloured boxes and recessed balconies.

The ambition for the materiality and detailed design is to create a high quality residential atmosphere with robust and reduced maintenance details.

Window frames are proposed to be grey with ppc grey metal reveals to match the brickwork. This is then contrasted with bronze coloured cladding both to the window openings and the top floor, creating a layering and richness to the elevations.

To break down the mass of the building, the upper storey is articulated in bronze boxes, providing an easily identifiable and light roofscape.

5.0 Summary

We believe our proposals are a considered response to the site's context and are of an appropriate design quality.

architects+designers

SGI Studios
1 Kelso Place
Manchester M15 4LE
t: +44 (0)161 832 9842
e: mail@hodderandpartners.com
w: www.hodderandpartners.com

hodder+partners

Appendix C - Urban Design Peer Review prepared by Mr Colin Pullan



**Lambert
Smith
Hampton**

www.lsh.co.uk

Urban Design Peer Review

**Blackbird Yard,
Land Junction of Parrs Wood Lane,
Manchester**

On behalf of

Dandara Living Developments Limited

Prepared by
Colin Pullan BA(Hons) DipUD
Director - Urban Design & Masterplanning
Planning, Regeneration + Infrastructure
Lambert Smith Hampton
55 Wells Street,
London,
W1T 3PT

Tel: 0207 198 2000

Date: 24th April 2023

CONTENTS

1.	Qualifications and Experience	1
2.	Introduction	2
3.	Review	3
	1. Context.....	3
	2. Identity.....	5
	3. Built form	6
	Layout	6
	Height, scale and massing	7
	4. Movement.....	8
	5. Nature	9
	Public spaces	9
	7. Uses.....	10
	8. Homes and buildings.....	10
	9. Resources	11
	10. Lifespan	12
4.	Summary.....	13
5.	Appendix 1.....	14

1. Qualifications and Experience

- 1.1. My name is Colin Michael Pullan. I am Head of Urban Design and Masterplanning at Lambert Smith Hampton (LSH). I hold a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Planning and a Post Graduate Diploma in Urban Design. I am on the executive of, and former Chair of, the Urban Design Group, a membership charity established in 1978 open to all who care about the quality of life in our cities, towns and villages and believe that raising standards of urban design is central to its improvement.
- 1.2. I have over 35 years' experience as an urban designer in the private sector, covering all design matters. I studied at the Oxford Polytechnic JCUD (now Oxford Brookes), one of the most distinguished urban design universities before moving into private practice as an urban designer/masterplanner at Thamesmead Town Ltd from 1987. From Thamesmead Town Ltd I moved into a private consultancy at Town Planning Consultancy in 1995 and then Chapman Warren Associates in 1999, during which time my experience broadened to take on national projects and more general planning and urban design issues.
- 1.3. From 2000 until 2011 I worked at RPS, a multidisciplinary practice where my responsibility as Urban Design Director was to provide sound urban design advice to public and private sector clients, with an awareness of both current and emerging best practice. In February 2011 I joined Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (now Lichfields). In January 2019 I joined LSH to head up their Urban Design team.
- 1.4. I have been the principal urban designer on many residential projects for both private and public sector clients and have very considerable experience in the preparation of layout and masterplans supported by development strategies, development briefs and design statements including the location of tall buildings within urban centres.
- 1.5. I am familiar with the site and surrounding area and I have studied the relevant national, regional and local plan policy background.
- 1.6. LSH was first appointed by Dandara Living Developments Limited in December 2022 to undertake this review.

2. Introduction

- 2.1. This urban design peer review has been prepared for Dandara Living with regard to the planning application (reference: 133746/FO/2022) for the “erection of a 6 storey residential building (Use Class C) comprising 75 no. apartments together with ground floor residential amenity space, landscaping, cycle parking, car parking and associated works”.
- 2.2. There are a number of relevant urban design criteria set by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Local Plan Policies, guidance and the National Design Guide (NDG) which provide the basis upon which design quality can be measured (but which I do not recite in this review). Accordingly this audit undertakes a review of the scheme against these criteria (which are summarised at Table 1 in the appendix).
- 2.3. The NPPG establishes that ‘good design’ can be described with reference to the ten characteristics of the NDG, and in accordance with the NDG and National Model Design Code (NMDC) criteria can inform judgements of design quality and beauty. The NDG therefore forms the structure for this appraisal with reference to relevant design policies and guidance.
- 2.4. This review has been undertaken with regard to the application material and a site visit.

3. Review

1. Context

- 3.1. Consistent with the NDG the application scheme was supported by a Design and Access Statement (DAS) which describes the surrounding character / context and demonstrates that the design team had an appropriate understanding of site features, its surrounds and relationship to local characteristics.
- 3.2. The site is within a sustainable location and well located in relation to public transport, with the East Didsbury Metrolink stop located across Kingsway and East Didsbury Train Station located approximately 250m to the south west of the site. There is one bus stop immediately adjacent the southern boundary to the site and further seven stops within three minutes' walk.
- 3.3. The triangular site comprises 0.24ha of the western end of the existing car park which is surplus to Tesco's requirements.
- 3.4. The site addresses Parrs Wood Lane to the south, the Tesco entrance road to the south west and to the north of the site, the remaining part of the car park, beyond which the Tesco Superstore.
- 3.5. To the east of the site is Kingsway, one of the principal dual carriageway routes from the wider highways network into Manchester city centre. Across from Kingsway are a Travelodge and the Parrs Wood Entertainment centre.
- 3.6. To the south of Parrs Wood Road, is a triangular shaped park that occupies the space between three highway junctions. Beyond are three large residential blocks in the space bound by Kingsway to the east and an elevated railway line to the west. The park, dating from the 1920s is a historic feature of the area and has a number of significant mature trees within it. The park is formally laid out space and provides an attractive amenity space for the local residents.
- 3.7. The site is set below the level of Parrs Wood Lane, such that level access is most readily achieved from the west and the present Tesco entrance.

- 3.8. The site is not within a conservation area. The Didsbury St James Conservation Area lies to the west of Parrs Wood Lane and the site, approximately 200m away from the site. The Conservation Area has many Listed Buildings within the boundary, however, it is understood there are none with a direct affect from the proposed site.
- 3.9. Previous to the current Tesco superstore and car park, the area housed the Parrs Wood Bus Depot, which opened in 1926 and was demolished in the late 1980s. The bus depot was located to the south of the area and occupied the entire site. A clock tower, retained from the bus depot, is located adjacent to, but outside of, the site boundary to the east. This is currently used as Tesco signage.
- 3.10. The former bus depot presented a ‘built edge’ that complimented in scale and pattern the built edge to the south of the space (Parrs Wood Court). Up until the demolition of the bus depot, Parrs Wood Court (and the adjacent Citipeak scheme), the depot and railway embankment defined two edges of the triangular park which is contained to the east by Kingsway. The scheme repairs the lost frontage to the space and retains the local landmark value and interest of the clock tower in terms of its townscape as seen from the surrounding streets and park (as affirmed by the Heritage Note prepared by Heritage Architecture Ltd).
- 3.11. In terms of land uses, the frontage to the immediate west of Kingsway is predominantly leisure use with a hotel. Along a linear corridor between Kingsway to the east and the elevated railway line to the west the land use is predominantly residential with some retail uses to the south (a small parade of shops) and the Tesco store. West of the railway line the land use is predominantly residential with a small local centre on Parrs Wood Lane. Although the railway line and bridge may be perceived as a ‘barrier’ between the wider East Didsbury community, the site and the apartments to the south of the park, there are clear views afforded beneath the railway bridge; the underpass is animated with public art and the close proximity of a bus stop, parade of shops on Parrs Wood Lane, and station entrance make this a busy and perceivably safe space – such that the apartment schemes within the linear corridor are not ‘isolated’.
- 3.12. Access is appropriately taken from the south west corner, retaining the boundary to Parrs Wood Lane and the edge of the park, having regard to levels and where most residents and visitors are likely to access the site.

2. Identity

Make it Manchester: Strong Character: Mix of Old and New: Appropriate Density

- 3.13. Consistent with the objective of the Manchester Residential Quality Guidance and the Guide to developing in Manchester SPD (SPD) the proposed scheme draws upon the shape of the site to ensure that buildings relate to each other and promote a sense of place – in this instance the common scale and density of built form around the central park and visually integrating the existing clock tower into a scheme.
- 3.14. In terms of land use, a residential apartment block would be in context with the pattern of development to the immediate south of the park (Parrs Wood Green / Citipeak). This makes it an appropriate location for an urban residential scheme at an appropriate density with a low number of car parking spaces and a focus on cycling and walking.
- 3.15. NPPF paragraphs 126 and 128 refer to the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places as fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. The Manchester Residential Quality Guidance, states that Manchester should understand and appreciate those qualities that make it special, particularly the legacy of its industrial and Victorian architecture that has shaped much of the city centre and its outlying areas. This has been demonstrated as a theme in the DAS.
- 3.16. The scheme responds to the immediate context having regard to scale, height and massing, such that the general openness within the park, which is contained by the mature trees, would remain a prominent feature of the local context and the proposed built form is of a similar scale to the surrounding residential development. The siting of the proposed building would 'repair' the lost frontage to the park and the residential use compliment that across the park at Citipeak and Parrs Wood Court.
- 3.17. Considering 'beauty' a subjective term at best, the context affords a wide degree of latitude as to acceptable architectural form and design. The DAS appropriately states on page 20 that the 'area has no defined architectural style' and it is of merit that the scheme draws upon the 'industrial and transportation history' which is a feature of this context (Kingsway, the railway and bus depot form the 1920s and the railway earlier) to inform the character and appearance of the design. The DAS acknowledges the history of the site and the architecture

of the railway and former building to inform the design. The former clock tower is appropriately retained as a feature of the immediate context.

- 3.18. There are also references to the terraced housing form in shaping the form of the apartment block, which in addition to the overall height, proportion and treatment of base, middle and top, with interesting detailing and colour, lends a 'human scale' to the appearance as recommended by the Living with beauty: report of the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission.

3. Built form

Make it Bring People Together: A mix of People: Opportunities to Meet: A sense of Community

Make it Animate Streets and Spaces: Active Ground Floors: Opportunity for Observation: Public realm

Layout

- 3.19. As described by the DAS In accordance with Policy DM1 and EN1 the siting of the scheme has demonstrably been informed by the site context and adjacent uses - considering active frontages, overlooking and outlook – and the former uses on the site.
- 3.20. The form of the layout avoids dwellings having a direct outlook over the adjacent the car park and addresses Parris Wood Road and the entrance into the site.
- 3.21. The principal active edges and the entrances are located towards the south and nearest the points of arrival from the station and East Didsbury having regard to levels. The proposals will allow for a flow of activity around the building creating a natural surveillance of the surrounding spaces. The Community space provides opportunity for wider social interaction.
- 3.22. Car parking is appropriately accommodated at ground floor beneath the building and to the rear. The level change and active frontage to Parris Wood Lane mitigates the otherwise inactive frontages that arise from the location of parked cars, services and bike storage at the ground floor. This approach also elevates the residential uses above the service areas, affording a more beneficial outlook.

Height, scale and massing

- 3.23. The proposed heights and massing have been taken into consideration with the existing context and are addressed in the DAS. The approach to height, scale and massing is consistent with Policy SP1, EN1 and DM1 and the Manchester Residential Quality Guidance, having regard to the, Impact on the surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale and appearance and character. The building will positively contribute to place making, and the legibility (spatial enclosure) of the park as noted earlier.
- 3.24. Consistent with the Guidance Notes for Design Codes, which provide useful references in determining how to design appropriate buildings the scheme responds to the general uniformity of height around the park. In accordance with paragraph 112 of the guidance:
- “112. Building heights influence the quality of a place in terms of its identity and the environment for occupiers and users. Consistent building heights, or variation within a relatively narrow range, can help to make an area type feel coherent.”*
- 3.25. This approach, and the siting of the building is also consistent with the SPD: Buildings should relate well to each other:
- “2.13 The scale, position and external appearance of new buildings should respect their setting and relationship to adjacent buildings, enhance the street scene and consider their impact on the roof line and skyline.”*
- 3.26. The design decisions that resolved the proposed height are set out in the DAS which illustrates a number of studies aimed at determining an appropriate response in terms of height, scale and massing at which the building would add interest to the open space, relate to the scale of adjacent buildings and retain the distinctiveness of the clock tower.
- 3.27. The DAS describes the proportions of the building which is characteristic of a tripartite façade, incorporating a base containing, a middle section of uniform design, with a crown element and set back to form the top; an appropriate way to address tall buildings consistent with the NDG and the NMDC. The form of the building is well articulated from all elevations with a brick frame creating both horizontal and vertical rhythm to break down the mass of the building into what is described as townhouse forms. The verticality that these townscape forms add to the elevational responds very well to the verticality of the retained clock tower,

particularly the vertically aligned square openings created by the brick frame in the mid-section of the elevation.

- 3.28. The building has a well-defined base with elevated terraces and areas of landscaping. At ground floor and considerate of the levels and proximity to the retained car park, the scheme appropriately locates parking, a community space, communal and service area and entrances with accommodation above. The elevation to this road is slightly stepped up due to the ground floor parking and topography of the site.
- 3.29. The upper floor is differentiated by a variation in material (lighter bronze) and visibly sits above a heavier brick frame. The contemporary design and location of services creates a simple, flat roof form consistent with the roof form of Parrs Wood and allows for the retained clock tower to be distinctive.
- 3.30. All the elevations are similarly treated, the southern elevations are characterised by inset balconies and the northern by projecting balconies.
- 3.31. The scheme has a simple palette of materials applied across the elevations, with brick differentiating the base, frame and corner of the building. The natural colour tones – the buff brick and bronze paneling complement the brick tone of Parrs Wood Court and the woodland within the park. This approach is consistent with the Manchester Residential Quality Guidance that states that the best schemes – both traditional and modern – use a limited palette of materials and have a strong logic for the choices made, and for where changes in material should occur.
- 3.32. The scheme will not provide a public realm of its own but will contribute to the park and south western edge with an attractive façade overlooking the existing public spaces and provide a communal space with a terrace. The surrounding street scenes would be animated with entrances, windows and balconies.

4. Movement

Make it Easy to Get Around: A Connected Network: Modal Choice: Legibility

Make it Animate Streets and Spaces: Active Ground Floors: Opportunities for Observation:
Public Realm

- 3.33. The site is in a sustainable location, within an existing legible network of streets and footpaths that promotes walking. The main pedestrian access to the building along with the cycle storage access is to the south west, which will create a greater footfall creating an active location on the site.
- 3.34. The ground floor entrance to Parrs Wood Lane also provides a legible arrival space into the building leading to a central core, which also provides access to the cycle store, accommodation and underground parking area. Entrances to the building are clearly defined at ground floor and coincide with vertical rhythms created by the alignment of windows in the elevation.
- 3.35. On levels 1 to 6 the access to each individual apartment are from a central corridor which may be - from the floor plans would be - naturally lit at either end. This is not clear from the elevations however. The two corridors connect to both stair cores, affording opportunity for people to meet and bring neighbours together consistent with the Manchester Residential Quality Guidance.
- 3.36. The scheme proposes two lift cores, above the requirement of the Manchester Residential Quality Guidance.

5. Nature

- 3.37. ***Make it Work with the Landscape: Green Infrastructure: Blue Infrastructure***
- 3.38. A soft and hard landscaping strategy with a tree planting strategy is provided. 21 trees will be removed from the site for the development, while some 35 new trees (as taken from the landscape plan 262-LYR-XX-ZZ-DWG-L-1001) will be planted around the perimeter of the site boundary in planting beds.

Public spaces

Make it Bring People Together: A mix of People: Opportunities to meet: A sense of Community

Make it Animate Streets and Spaces: Active Ground Floors: Opportunity for Observation: Public realm

- 3.39. The scheme does not provide public space but will contribute to the surrounding streets – in terms of providing active frontages – principally to the south east elevation overlooking Parrs Wood Lane and turning the corner into the access road.
- 3.40. Communal open space will be provided at two external hard landscaped areas, one to the southern entrance to the building and one to the northern from the parking courtyard / service area. Both spaces are access to the building rather than a meaning space for residential amenity. However, the park is immediately across from the scheme and would provide a valuable amenity space for residents and opportunity for the community to meet and socialize.

7. Uses

- 3.41. The number of dwellings represents an efficient use of land in a sustainable location.
- 3.42. The density of development optimizes the capacity of the site recognizing that the Manchester Residential Quality Guidance encourages an increase in density for well-connected sites.

8. Homes and buildings

***Make it Bring People Together:** A mix of People: Opportunities to Meet: A sense of Community*

***Make it a Home:** A Clear Threshold and Entrance: Space and Daylight: Storage: Privacy*

***Make it Practical:** Dealing with Cars: Tidy up Waste: Cycle Parking and Storage*

- 3.43. The scheme proposes single (1/2person), two and three bed apartments.
- 3.44. The scheme proposes predominantly single aspect dwellings. Dual aspect dwellings have many benefits and are preferred as they can provide for better daylight and direct sunlight, have natural cross-ventilation avoiding overheating, and a choice of outlook. In accordance with the Manchester Residential Quality Guidance there are no north facing single aspect dwellings and considering amenity and outlook, the single aspect apartments are generally arrange to have either south westerly /easterly views or north easterly / westerly views avoiding being directly south and therein subject to direct sunlight. The Environmental Standards Statement concludes that the HQM pre-assessment reports schemes meet the

required HQM standards for temperature and ventilation to maintain a healthy living environment.

- 3.45. The application is supported by a Daylight Assessment which considers the effects of the scheme on neighbouring dwellings but not the proposals.
- 3.46. Most dwellings have access to private outdoor amenity space (balconies) except for those around the central core. This is a design decision (the treatment of the corner elevation and the avoidance of overlooking between dwellings on the inside corner). For those that do not have balconies, there are Juliet balconies. A park is within 10m of the proposed building. Although the scheme does not meet the Manchester Residential Design Guidance 'Key Action' to provide private amenity space for each dwelling, the reasoned justification appropriately has regard to the type of accommodation, the design response of the building to its context, the provision of an internal community space, outdoor residents' terrace, and the accessibility to the local park.
- 3.47. The building design has appropriately considered servicing, access to refuse and servicing.

9. Resources

Make it Happen: Construction Detail: Value Engineering: Construction Compliance

- 3.48. The scheme is considered to achieve the optimum and efficient use of this brownfield site. The Environmental Standards Statement sets out the approach to meeting energy and climate change performance indicators, principally a fabric first approach. A PV system is proposed for the roof. The Environmental Standards Statement notes that full compliance with the key criteria of the Manchester Core Strategy has been achieved by the proposed energy strategy while responding to Manchester City Council's declaration of a Climate Emergency.
- 3.49. Indicative Standard Assessment Procedure calculations demonstrates that the Dwelling mission Rate reduction for Parrs Wood scheme will provide an improvement over the Part L1A (2013) compliance standard as a consequence of the proposed enhanced fabric specification, efficient mechanical and electrical systems coupled with on-site micro generation.

10. Lifespan

Manage it Well

Make it Future Proof: Resilience: Adaptability: Technology

- 3.50. The DAS and supporting management strategy sets out the maintenance and management regime expected of the building with regard to waste/ recycling / façade maintenance and access.

4. Summary

- 4.1. The scheme would provide a high quality, well designed development that optimises the use of this brownfield site whilst being sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area.
- 4.2. Having undertaken an appraisal of the appeal scheme against the criteria set by the NPPF, the NDG and supporting local policy and guidance; I consider that the building would be of high quality. In my opinion, the scheme is well-designed and contextually appropriate having regard to local character.

5. Appendix 1

- 5.1. Table 1 below summarises the appropriateness of the scheme. Having reviewed the submission and the policy/guidance as set out in the Table I consider this is a well design scheme.

TABLE 1	
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	
Paragraph 124: Appropriate densities	The scheme has a proposed density (312dph) reflected through the compact nature of the site and number of storeys, which reflect the surrounding context and accessibility to multiple transit stations, which link into the city centre of Manchester.
Paragraph 125: Optimising the site	The scheme is considered to be optimising the use of the site having regard to surrounding built form.
Paragraph 126: High quality buildings and spaces	This is a high quality building which has taken an informed approach from the historical context of the site and transportation industry.
Paragraph 130: which sets six qualitative criteria	The scheme demonstrably responds positively to the criteria. The scheme is considered to create a strong sense of place which appropriate references to the historical context of the site which informed the massing. The scheme does not diminish the local landmark value of the clock tower in terms of its townscape. The scheme proposes to provide a scheme that is accessible and in a sustainable location.
Paragraph 132: Design quality	The scheme is considered to be of a high quality.
Paragraph 133: Improving design	As described in the DAS, the scheme has evolved through numerous meetings with the local authority, as well as with local councillors and the public. Taking place from September 2021 through to March 2022.
Paragraph 134: Design quality and character	The scheme demonstrably improves the quality of the area, replacing an existing car park edge to the park with a reinstated frontage.
Paragraph 134b: Innovation, sustainability and raising design standards	75 cycle parking spaces will help with encouraging cycling in the local area, along with promoting sustainable transport use due to the close location of public transport links.
NPPF	
Paragraph 8: Achieving sustainable development	The scheme will foster a well-designed building, which will add to the streetscene that is emerging and

	'framing' the park.
Paragraph 92: achieving healthy, inclusive and safe places	The scheme is promoting a healthy lifestyle through being in a sustainable location, promoting active living and travel and within, the opportunity for residents to meet and socialise. The scheme has been designed to adhere to the National Described Space Standards (NDSS) and Manchester Residential Quality Guidance.
Paragraph 105: Promoting sustainable transport	The scheme is conveniently located accessible to services and amenities. This will encourage residents to walk, cycle and use the public transport options available.
Paragraph 125: Good design	The scheme creates a high quality, well designed building. The layout of the building also creates a principal frontage with Parrs Wood Lane and the adjacent buildings around Kingsway.
Paragraph 130: Street trees	The scheme is proposing to plant 35 new trees (as taken from the landscape plan 262-LYR-XX-ZZ-DWG-L-1001) around the site edges. Along with a mixture of planting, acting as a buffer to Kingsway and integrating with the immediate context.
Paragraph 133: Refusing development that is not well designed	The scheme is well designed and has regard local design policies and guidance on design.
National Planning Policy Guidance - Design: process and tools	
Enhance the quality buildings and spaces	The scheme enhances the quality of surrounding buildings and spaces.
Promote character in townscape and landscape	The scheme promotes character in the townscape through the form and mass being informed by the site's historical context. Height is also in line with the immediate existing context.
Natural features and local heritage resources can help give shape to a development and integrate it into the wider area	The scheme uses the slightly irregular shape of the site to its advantage, which allows the building to provide a corner turning building with a principal frontage on Parrs Wood Lane.
High quality hard and soft landscape design ...improves the overall quality of townscape or landscape	The scheme contributes to the landscape of the site and the surrounding area. The proposed townscape has been taken into consideration and justification is provided within the DAS.
... The use of local materials, building methods and details can be an important factor in enhancing local distinctiveness...	The proposed building utilises the colour of the historical transport industry as previously stated.

National Design Guide	
1. Context	The DAS shows an understanding of the site and context. The site is within a sustainable location.
2. Identity	The scheme is informed by the historic form and character of the former use of the site, referring to the previous historical transportation industry. The form and articulation of the building particularly is informed by this, which also creates a positive elevation which will add interest and aid in the development of the streetscene.
3. Built form	The built form of the scheme has created active frontages to the principal streets. The proposed heights and massing have been taken into consideration and have emerged from the surrounding context and historical context.
4. Movement	The site is in a sustainable location. The scheme is structured within an existing legible network of streets and footpaths and close to public transport links into Manchester city centre.
5. Nature	Landscaping and tree planting is provided.
6. Public spaces	Due to the compact nature of the site, there is no public space. However, there are many public open green spaces in walking and cycling distance for residents.
7. Uses	The scheme is for residential and community use.
8. Homes and buildings	With reference to the DAS and floor plans, the apartments achieve or exceed the minimum space standards required. As previously mentioned, there are single aspect apartments and some of these do not have outdoor private amenity space.
9. Resources	Compliant as previously described in section 3.
10. Lifespan	Compliant as previously described in section 3.
Manchester's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012)	
Policy CC 9: Design and heritage	Compliant as previously described.
Policy CC 10: A place for everyone	The scheme provides a mix of accommodation and a communal community room.
Policy H 6: South Manchester	Between 2009 and 2027 it is projected that South Manchester will need to accommodate circa 3,240 homes. The proposed site will make a contribution towards this figure in a sustainable location.

Guide to developing in Manchester (SPD) 2007	
Design	
UDP Part 1 Policies H2.7, I3.1 and S2.5 all deal with the City Council's expectation that new development, whether for residential, industrial, commercial or retail purposes, should have a high standard of design making a positive contribution to the City's environment. UDP Part 1 Policy E3.3 encourages new development along the City's major radial and orbital routes to be of the highest quality. The following sub-sections articulate in greater detail what the City Council means when it refers to a high standard of design.	
Character and Context: A place with its own identity	Compliant as above.
Continuity and Enclosure: A place where public and private spaces are clearly distinguished	Compliant as above.
Legibility: A place that has a clear image and is easy to understand	Compliant as above. The principal entrance to the building on Parrs Wood Lane is clearly legible and distinguishable.
Ease of movement: A place that is easy to get to and move through	Compliant as above.
Quality of public realm: A place with attractive and successful public areas	Compliant as above. Considering the compact nature of the site, the proposals seek to integrate the site through planting and tree planting. The scheme will add active edges to Parrs Wood Lane.
Diversity: A place with variety and choice	The residential development will add to the vitality of the local area and be an addition to the community (the communal room).
Adaptability: A place that can accommodate change and innovation	Whilst a residential use, the local community space will be available to residents, community members and local businesses to use to meet and gather.
Manchester Residential Quality Guidance 2017 (Interim Guidance) - Salient points.	
Neighbourhood / Street Block / Building / Building	
Strong Character	The scheme has a strong character as described above.
Mix of old and new	The DAS describes the historical context of the site. The historical past of transportation has informed the colours and material palette as previously mentioned.
Appropriate density	Compliant based on the existing context.
Protect and frame views	The new building will be another piece of development that is framing the park on Kingsway. Views to the clock tower will remain, and reinstated in context with a building of similar scale (all be it taller)

	to what was previously there.
Appreciate scale	Compliant (with regard to existing apartments at Citipeak and Parrs Wood Court).
Materials and details	Compliant as described above.
New design approaches	Compliant as described above.
Ensure connections to a destination	Compliant as described above.
Meet the neighbours	Compliant as described above.
Housing for all	Compliant as described above. Providing a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom apartments.
Encourage activity	Compliant as described above.
Real street frontage	Compliant as described above.
Public realm	Compliant as described above.
Incorporate landscape	Compliant as described above.
Appreciate microclimate	As set out in the Environmental Standards Statement the scheme considers matters of heating, ventilation. The application is also supported by an Air Quality Assessment.
Tidy up waste	Compliant as described above. Services are to the rear of building and not interrupting the streetscene or principal frontage.
Cycle parking and storage	Compliant as described above.
Sustainability	Compliant as set out above.
Privacy	Compliant as described above. Building is stand-alone with immediate buildings at more than an appropriate distance away.
Space and daylight	A sunlight daylight assessment would need to be undertaken to provide commentary for future residents. A study has been provided for existing
Internal circulation	Query note: glazing of internal long corridors.
Visual privacy (back to back)	No surrounding buildings within close enough distance to be a consideration. Proposed building shape doesn't harm visual amenity.
Private external amenity space	There is a residents' terrace' with some seating proposed, balconies and a public open green space is within close proximity to the site.

Appendix D - Heritage Note prepared by Stephen Levrant Heritage Architecture



21 April 2023

**Heritage Note to support Appeal for Land Junction of Parrs Wood Lane, Manchester, M20 5AA
(Application number: 133746/FO/2022) – Heritage Architecture Ltd.**

1.1 Introduction and background

The following Appeal addendum note has been prepared by Heritage Architecture Ltd (HA) to support the Appeal for the following application: Land Junction of Parrs Wood Lane, Manchester, M20 5AA (ref: 133746/FO/2022).

Planning permission for the *erection of a 6 storey residential building (Use Class C3) comprising 75 no. apartments together with ground floor residential amenity space, landscaping, cycle parking, car parking and associated works* was refused by MCC on 2nd August 2022. The Reasons for Refusal (RfR) are identified within Appendix A (Decision Notice). The Appellant is Dandara Living Developments Limited and the Local Planning Authority (LPA) is Manchester City Centre (MCC). This note should be read in conjunction with the Statement of Case (SoC) prepared by CBRE and the Design and Access Statement (Hodders + Partners).

Although it will be evident that none of the RfR specifically relate to the historic built environment or heritage impact, concern was raised within MCC's Committee Report with regards to the potential impact of the proposals upon the 'landmark status' of an early 20th century clock tower, which is situated to the immediate east of the Appeal Site boundary.

The purpose of the following note is to assess the relative significance of the clock tower and its heritage status. The outcome of this will inform the degree of material weight the structure should be given within the Planning balance.

1.2 Heritage Significance

The clock tower at East Didsbury's Tesco store is all that remains of the Parrs Wood bus garage (refer to **Figures 1 and 2, Appendix I**). The bus garage opened on 23rd March 1926, forming the first purpose-built bus garage by the Manchester Corporation Transport Department¹. The garage was extended in 1931 and was able to hold up to fifty motor buses at a time. The bus garage closed in 1971 and subsequently demolished in the 1980s. The introduction of the Tesco Superstore in 1989 transformed

¹ Manchester Corporation Transport Department 2016 – The Buses 1906-1969. The Local Transport History Library. Source: <http://www.lthlibrary.org.uk/library/PDF-079-1.pdf>. Accessed 20.04.23.

the character of the area, which had become increasingly residential by the end of the 20th century. The clock tower was adopted by Tesco and now features their distinctive logo to each face.

The clock tower holds the junction of Kingsway and the A5145, forming a way finder within the townscape. The total loss of the bus garage in the late-20th century has reduced the architectural and historic interest of the site to a considerable degree, rendering the clock tower devoid of its historic context.

Although the setting of the clock tower has been eroded, principally due to the loss of the original bus garage, the clock tower continues to be experienced alongside an expansive network of roads, which is consistent with the site's former use as a bus depot. This makes some minor positive contribution to the ability to understand and appreciate the former use of the site. It is considered the clock tower retains some (limited) local historic interest through its positioning, scale and landmark townscape status. Overall, the clock tower has some definable historic interest, deriving from its communal value, but this interest is very limited, even at local level. This negligible value is further recognised by the unidentified heritage status of the clock tower (discussed further below).

1.3 Heritage Impact and Planning Balance

The recognised definition of a 'heritage asset' as stated within Annex 2 of the NPPF (2021) is: *A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).*

As stated within the SoC, the clock tower currently has no identified status in Planning terms. The clock tower is not a statutorily listed building and is not located within a designated conservation area. It will therefore be evident the requirements of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990 and the policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021), in relation to designated heritage assets are not applicable.

At the time of writing, MCC do not retain a Local List and have not identified the clock tower to be considered a 'non-designated heritage asset' within their SoC. As the Planning Practice Guide (PPG) makes clear, *'Irrespective of how they are identified, it is important that the decisions to identify them as non-designated heritage assets are based on sound evidence. Plan-making bodies should make clear and up to date information on non-designated heritage assets accessible to the public to provide greater clarity and certainty for developers and decision-makers. This includes information on the criteria used to select non-designated heritage assets and information about the location of existing assets.'* (Paragraph: 040 Reference ID: 18a-040-20190723)'.

In the absence of such criteria, the heritage interest of the clock tower, even at local level, is demonstrably negligible and is therefore considered to be at the lowest end of the spectrum of heritage interest (refer to **Appendix II** for heritage spectrum and definitions). The clock tower is consequently afforded little to no material weight in the Planning balance.

1.4 Conclusion

Although it will be evident the Appeal scheme will result in some visual change to the composition of the townscape, the clocktower will continue to be appreciable in key vistas looking south along Kingsway. In accordance with the unidentified heritage status of the early 20th century structure, the setting of the clocktower should be also afforded limited material weight.

The Appeal scheme will not incur any long-term, physical impact (or total loss) of the clocktower and despite the scale of the proposals, would not have a highly detrimental impact upon its setting.

To conclude, the historic interest of the clocktower will remain unaffected by the Appeal scheme and due to the structure yielding limited identified status, the overarching impact on the built historic environment will be negligible.

Appendix I: Historic Images



Figure 1: Parrswood Bus Garage, pictured c.1930 from Kingsway looking north-west. The clock tower is readily identifiable to the left side of the image, accompanied by a range of brick built sheds with pitched roofs. **Source:** Manchester Local Image Collection. Ref: m75257



Figure 2: Oblique aerial view of Parrswood Bus Depot, pictured c.1929. The aerial image provides further detail on the original extent and layout of the Bus Depot, illustrating the clock tower formed a very minor component of the site.

Appendix II: Definition of Significance Terms

Table 1: The hierarchy and definition of heritage significance relevant to the redevelopment of the Site (tailored from ICOMOS & Historic England guidance)

Heritage status / hierarchy	Description.
Very High / Exceptional heritage significance <i>International architectural and historic interest and importance.</i>	This heritage grading relates to the fabric and setting of: - Scheduled Ancient Monuments, - Grade-I listed buildings, - Grade-I historic parks/gardens, - and battlefields, defined by statute, where the particular site is well represented in the impacted historic environment.
High heritage significance <i>National architectural and historic importance and interest.</i>	This heritage grading relates to the fabric and setting of: - Grade-II* and grade-II listed buildings, - Grade-II* and grade-II historic parks/gardens, - battlefields, as defined by statute, - Conservation Areas containing very Important buildings where the particular site is well represented in the impacted historic environment.
Medium heritage significance <i>Regional architectural and historic importance and interest.</i>	This heritage grading relates to the fabric and setting of: - Grade-II listed buildings (dependant on character), - Grade-II historic parks/gardens and battlefields, - designated Conservation Areas, - Unscheduled archaeological sites and landscapes of potential national interest where the fabric and character of the site is well represented in the impacted historic environment.
Low heritage significance <i>Local architectural and historic heritage importance and interest.</i>	This heritage grading relates to the fabric and setting of: - Locally Listed Buildings (as formally identified by the Council and defined by an adopted Local Planning Policy), - Site's identified and recorded as being of heritage interest on the Historic Environment Record, which retain a definable heritage interest as a component of the historic environment. - unrecorded buildings, structures, or designed landscape features, which demonstrably retain a degree of heritage value due to their: architectural design, historic, communal, or townscape interest.
Negligible heritage significance <i>Buildings or fabric components which have been extensively altered, eroding or compromising their architectural and historic interest. Or sites with negligible Planning status.</i>	This heritage grading relates to sites which may be: - recorded on the Historic Environment Record in record form or as 'Find Sites' but retain minimal or no original fabric or definable character. - buildings, structures, or designed landscape features, which make limited contribution to the architectural historic, communal, or townscape interest of the principal heritage asset. - Buildings with some historic, architectural or communal interest with no identifiable status (local, regional or national).
Unknown heritage potential <i>Buildings/sites where the potential importance interest requires determination</i>	This heritage grading relates to sites which may be locally identified as meriting recognition but have not been previously recorded or investigated so that their origins and fabric significance have yet to be objectively defined.