

# Comments for Planning Application 135675/FO/2022

## Application Summary

Application Number: 135675/FO/2022

Address: Tariff Street Manchester

Proposal: Erection of two residential apartment buildings (Use Class C3) comprising Block 1 -part 9, part 10 (plus roof level amenity block) and Block 2- 12 storey building (comprising of 261 dwellings in total) above basement levels with ground floor commercial units (Use Class E (excluding E (b)), associated residents amenity space, cycle parking, landscaping, access, street loading and other associated works following demolition of the existing building and structures on site

Case Officer: Angela Leckie

## Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: It is worth noting that this objection is not one of anti-development but a request for something better that doesn't have a severely detrimental impact on local residents, neighbouring public realm as well as our cities heritage assets. Below I have summarised key areas that form the basis of our objection in an exec summary and added further detail in the body of this email; all of which on their own make a strong case as to why this application should be rejected, but collectively, I'm struggling to see how there is any justification to approve this scheme as it stands. In legal terms, the inclusion of Block 2 is wholly contradictory to local and national planning policies and will remove the public benefits promised under the recently approved Port Street scheme.

## Exec Summary

1. Heritage: Significant impact upon the setting of a Grade II\* Brownsfield Mill (Avro) through completely eliminating any visibility of the asset and its connection to the Northern Quarter. (Caused by Block 2)

2. Wind: Application causes areas which are actually classified within the wind report as being 'unsafe', within a seating area of public realm and completely undermines the intended use of neighbouring gardens/green space (Public realm at Port Street and Garden at Avro would no longer be suitable for seating). The proposed mitigation (hopefully someone else will plant some

trees) is actually frightening and represents a complete lack of accountability from the developer; we have spoken to the Living City how have not been made aware of the impact this development would have on both their proposed public realm and private outdoor space for one port street residents.

3. SRF: Removal of public realm, additional unit and height (Block 2) added and a shift in arrangement of the units to that proposed in the SRF. A complete inconstant approach to SRF; in the design and access statement it appears to have all buildings (even those which haven't gone through the planning process) in the lighting report it uses the SRF as a baseline as if the buildings are already there; the developer is picking a choosing when and what to include from the SRF to lessen the perceived impact of this development. It is worth revisiting the wording in the SRF (no detailed heritage/wind/lighting etc. assessments were done) that stipulate each individual development should be assessed on their own merits and the document does not give pre-planning authorisation.

4) Daylight/Sunlight: Significant loss of light (34%) to neighbouring residential units caused by inclusion of Block 2

5) Port Street Development Design: Removal of public benefit which was given significant material weighting in the planning balance, and integral to offsetting harm to heritage assets. The inclusion of Block 2 will eradicate this public benefit and undermine the viability of the Port Street application.

For the reasons summarised above and detailed below, we implore the council to reject this application in its current form and invite the developer to return with a scheme more befitting of the site; specifically, remove block 2 in its entirety and replace with a joint up approach to the public realm positioned in the SRF and the Port Street Development. I would welcome the opportunity to either speak to yourself or the developer regarding this application. However, should this application progress to the planning committee in its current form I would request the opportunity to speak.

Details of area of concern

Heritage:

The proposed development is situated within the immediate setting of a Grade II\* Listed Building. The 1990 Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the NPPF (2021, para.199) stipulates that 'great weight' should be applied to preserving and or enhancing the setting of a Listed Building, emphasising the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Historic England's Guidance on Setting stresses that where harm is identified, every effort should be made to reduce, avoid or minimise this harm. It will be evident that 'Block 2' is the most harmful aspect of the proposals, incurring some significant impact upon the setting of the

Grade II\* Brownsfield Mill through completely eliminating any visibility of the asset and its connection to the Northern Quarter.

This viewpoint is depicted (although not referenced) as figure 3.12 in the applications supporting Heritage Statement (page 14 of 135675\_FO\_2022), however, we are missing a Baseline View of Viewpoint 20 - Tariff Street West within the applicants Design and Access Statement; I have sent this viewpoint in our email exchange which showcases that the Grade II\* Listed Building in the foreground which would be completely eliminated by the approval and build of Block 2.

We implore the Local Planning Authority to apply great weight to the Grade II\* Listed Building and encourage the removal of 'Block 2' from the proposals, this would alleviate the impact upon the heritage asset exponentially and encourage a much-improved visual corridor from the building onto the Northern Quarter.

Wind:

P.18 of the Wind Report of this application; 135675\_FO\_2022) depicts a significant area of proposed public realm which is considered unsafe for a sub-group of our society; table 03 in this report describes this as "Unsafe for frail individuals, or cyclists". This was not identified in the wind report of the Port Street Application (132489/FO/2021) so it's logical to deduce this unsafe area has been created by this application.

I am at a loss to try to comprehend how this council would consider this acceptable given the intended use of the space. The public realm as part of the Port Street Application (132489/FO/2021) was welcomed as much needed green space by neighbouring residents. The intended use of the space from the landscape strategy (132489\_FO\_2021) is a seating and grass area which will not only become unusable but also unsafe should the council approve this application. The mitigation here is genuinely, maybe someone else (Living City) will plant a tree to help here - the lack of accountability is shocking.

Additionally, the Wind Report shows (Figure 15 on P.18 and Figure 17 on P.19 within (135675\_FO\_2022) that in 'Summer' there is practically no area that would be considered suitable for 'sitting' in the new public realm of the Port Street Development and in 'Winter' the majority would only be suitable for Walking (Leisure). Moreover the report highlights the significant impact to the residents of the neighbouring building at Avro. Figure 15 shows the entire Private Garden of the development would not be suitable for sitting in Winter and only a small sub section in summer months (Figure 17). This area has multiple communal seating spaces and is used daily by its residents to socialise, play with their children, walk their dog etc; to approve this application would be to completely undermine the intended use of these garden/green spaces.

SRF:

There is significant deviation in terms of proposed height and arrangements of the units against the SRF. Moreover, the proposed area of public realm has also been removed.

1. The height proposed for Block 2 is understood to be 12 Storeys. The maximum height identified for this site within the approved SRF is Ground + 8. This change is significantly greater than the approved maximum within the SRF.
2. There has been a shift in the arrangement of the units (addition of Block 2 as well as additional massing in Block 1 joining what was depicted as two separate buildings in the SRF)
3. Proposed public realm within SRF has been removed and replaced with Block 2

Let's not try and dress this up as anything else that a developer attempting to utilise as much sq/ft available on their site to erect buildings and increase their economic benefit. As mentioned above, no weight or consideration has been given to local heritage assets in the design and the decision to remove proposed public realm is shocking; there was an opportunity to engage with 're-form landscape architecture' to expand and enhance the public realm and green space within the Port Street development.

#### Daylight and Sunlight:

There is evidence in the newly submitted report where certain units, within Avro, would have 34% loss of light; the report fails to acknowledge this major impact on residents who have no other source of light than the windows which will be significantly impacted by the build of block 2. To approve this scheme would be to subject the occupant(s) of this property to very low levels of light within their living space. It is not acceptable to ignore this whilst drawing conclusions of impact on the building (the majority of windows in Avro do not face this scheme hence rolled up percentages of the building is not an appropriate analysis).

However, even from the exec summary percentages (below) it's clear to see that it is the inclusion of block 2 that impacts compliance against VSC Daylight, NSL Daylight and APSH - when Block 2 is removed and the scheme only has Block 1 all revert to 100%. Although the developer is trying to argue small % decreases are 'acceptable' by grouping the building as a whole, as you can see above, this is caused by significant impacts to individual units.

Moreover, no weighting, acknowledgement or consideration has been given to the impact Block 2 will have on foliage within Avro's private garden or the Green Space/Public Realm in the Port Street development; it's a complete contraction by the developer to cite 'new trees' as a mitigation strategy for unsafe wind whilst designing a scheme which would eradicate their light source.

#### Contraction to Port Street Development Design

The recently approved Port Street scheme was consented on the basis that a new 'public realm'

would be implemented around the site. This aspect of the consented scheme was one of the key 'public benefits', which was afforded considerable planning weight. The current scheme, with particular focus on Block 2, will completely remove this agreed, 'open' public realm and therefore invalidate the public benefit. This is an absolute travesty and in direct conflict with the SRF principles. The loss of public realm space is completely unjustified within the submitted Planning documentation and is clearly a decision based on greed.

This overdevelopment will remove the promised public amenity space designed to create a connective route between neighbourhoods (Northern Quarter onto Ancoats) - again this was a key principle identified within the SRF and the Port Street Design. Block 2 will act as a barricade between the two, removing any benefit previously promised to local residents. This contradiction is an embarrassment and needs to be drawn to the attention of the Planning Committee.