



Appeal Under Section 78 of the TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (As Amended)

Written Statement by Manchester City Council

Appeal by Dandara Living Developments Limited Against the Decision of
Manchester City Council in refusing 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

At Land at the Junction of Parrs Wood Lane, Manchester, M20 5AA

Planning Inspectorate Ref: APP/B4215/W/23/3314646
Manchester City Council Planning Application Ref: 133746/FO/2022

25th APRIL 2023

1.INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This written statement has been prepared by the Council following the Case Management Conference held on the 29th March and the request of the Inspector for the Council to prepare a further statement setting out in greater detail the reasons the Council considers the updated information to have addressed their concerns in terms of highways and planning matters. This statement will set out a response to each of the three reasons for refusal in turn as they appear on the decision notice issued by the Council on 2nd August 2022.

2. REASON FOR REFUSAL 1

“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.”

- 2.1 Policies H1 and H6 have a general presumption to direct high density residential developments to the City Centre and district centres. Policy H1 sets out that new residential developments should amongst other things take account of the need to make provision for parking cars. Policy H6 indicates that outside of district centres the priorities are on housing which meets identified shortfalls, including family housing and provision that meets the needs of elderly people, with schemes adding to the stock of affordable housing.
- 2.2 In this instance, 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. As set out in the subsequent sections of this statement the appellant has addressed these concerns and, therefore, any harm originally identified has been addressed by this additional highway evidence.

- 2.3 The Council had not identified any other demonstrable harm caused by the type of accommodation to be provided at the site. 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 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 is compliant with Core Strategy policies H1, H6 and SP1.

3. REASON FOR REFUSAL 2

‘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.’

- 3.1 Since determination, the Appellant has provided extensive additional evidence to support the project. With respect to this reason for refusal, parking surveys were undertaken in November 2022 during neutral periods, i.e. there were no unusual influential factors that may have skewed any data collected. The cordon of streets surveyed was robust, the data collected thorough and the presentation clear.
- 3.2 The survey results show considerable on-street capacity for any overspill parking resulting from the site. The Appellant maintains that the development will provide sufficient parking within its demise and now with this additional evidence of the resilience of the surrounding streets, the second reason for refusal is considered to have been addressed by the Appellant and as a result the proposals have been demonstrated to be in compliance with Core Strategy policies DM1 and T2.

4. REASON FOR REFUSAL 3

'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.'

- 4.1 Since determination, the Appellant has provided extensive additional evidence to support the proposal. With respect to this reason for refusal, traffic surveys were undertaken in November 2022 during neutral periods, i.e. there were no unusual influential factors that may have skewed any data collected.
- 4.2 The survey data collected was then validated against a seven-day survey of the relevant highway link flows to ensure robustness. All of the data has been verified and therefore its use in the subsequent traffic modelling is considered appropriate.
- 4.3 The Appellant has then modelled five signalised junctions using industry standard software and following additional interrogation by Transport for Greater Manchester's technical team. The results of the assessment and the conclusions drawn are accepted, i.e. the development would not lead to any severe impact.
- 4.4 The modelling results show that the impacts would be acceptable to both Manchester City Council and Transport for Greater Manchester and as such, the third reason for refusal has been addressed by the Appellant and through this further evidence the applicant has demonstrated that the proposals would not give rise to unacceptable impacts to congestion on the highway network and is therefore compliant with Core Strategy policy T1.

5. CONCLUSION

- 5.1 As set out in the preceding sections, the Council considers that the proposals have been demonstrated to be in accordance with the adopted development plan policies set out within the Core Strategy and specifically those in the decision notice that the proposals were identified as being in conflict with. The applicant has demonstrated that the density of development proposed in this location can be accommodated without giving rise to unacceptable highway impacts either in terms of highway congestion or pressures for development generated on-street car parking. As such in the absence of any other identified harm the Council considers

that the form of development in this location together with the planning obligations to deliver affordable housing provision and measures to manage car parking and reduce the reliance on private cars by occupiers do comply with the adopted Development Plan as contained within the adopted Core Strategy.