

Comments for Planning Application 137227/FO/2023

Application Summary

Application Number: 137227/FO/2023

Address: Plot D Great Jackson Street Manchester M15 4NP

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

Case Officer: Lucy Harrison

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Support principle of high density development of this site.

This proposal constitutes poor planning and architecture in almost every way I can think of.

- 214 car parking spaces is far too many in a central part of the city. The other plots at GJS also have extensive underground car parking, and in the context of the Climate Emergency and Manchester City Council's ongoing plans to increase mode share for sustainable travel options, this feels like overkill. There is very little need for such a huge amount of car parking when most people living here will be able to walk to work and walk to all their daily errands.

- Ground floor interaction is truly terrible, with three quarters of the perimeter surrounded by some sort of race track/delivery loop. The council's long-term plan should be to downgrade the Mancunian Way to a more pedestrian-friendly environment. This site provided the perfect opportunity to try and open up development to the Mancunian Way, instead of turning its back on it. Instead we're left with a huge amount of dead space at ground floor level.

- Where the Hulme Park bridge meets the site, pedestrians are faced with a bin store, substation, and a motorway slip road. This is extraordinarily poor planning, and I wonder whether the architects were aware that the bridge actually exists? They have shown it on the plans, perhaps they thought it was closed? Manchester City Council should advise the developers and architects that there is a pedestrian bridge here, and to modify the arrival space into something that doesn't

stick its middle finger up to people on foot. Cafes, restaurants, shops and pedestrian-focused spaces should be prioritised here. The secondary entrance to the bridge (the staircase) is met with similar treatment. Do the architects hate pedestrians, or people from Hulme?

- Why isn't the motorway slip road being planned to be eradicated? This does not blend with this being a residential area. Is this poor planning on MCC Highway's behalf?

- Where Melbourne St meets Great Jackson St, there is a car-dominant pedestrian crossing. A continuous footway should be provided here to give priority to pedestrians. I think MCC Highways should be advised to travel to other cities both in the UK and abroad to see how professional Highways Departments are planning roads in the 21st-Century.

- Despite the height, this is one of the most boring proposals I have ever seen. Manchester is at the stage where we can now demand more refined and improved proposals. If a developer can't deliver something with a bit of flair, we no longer have to beg for investment and approve anything which comes our way. This scheme and the wider GJS masterplan is fast becoming one of the most bland areas of the country, with towers all of the same height, same cladding, with very little at ground floor to encourage pedestrians to explore. This is a very poor vision for Manchester.

Salford Council have done a much better job working with Renaker at Greengate, with human-scale podiums and high quality landscaping being created to tie together a strong, resilient district. GJS by comparison is boring and bland, and a result of poor, unrestricted planning. You have the opportunity to turn this around and demand more for Manchester.