

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 and Block 2- 12 storey building (comprising of 267 dwellings in total), with ground floor commercial units (Use Class E), associated residents amenity space, cycle parking, landscaping, access, street loading and other associated works following demolition of the existing building 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:First, a comment on procedure. This application consists of 73 documents, some of them over 200 pages long. I was informed of this application by a letter dated 9 December, which did not arrive near that date (presumably owing to the postal strike), asking for comments by 30 December. This struck me as unrealistic and I asked for more time -- initially being given a deadline of 13 January, then managing to extend this to 24 January. This does not strike me as a good way of encouraging comments from the community. More time should have been allotted from the beginning.

Moreover, I was told "the 24th will be fine but if you can get them to me earlier this would be appreciated as the applicant is pushing for feedback from the Neighbour notification process". There was no mention of the council telling the applicant it would be appreciated if it stopped pushing! Communications like this give the impression -- intentionally or not -- that the applicant is calling the shots, and further discourage members of the community from commenting on proposals.

On to the substance.

The Heritage Report states that 'considerable importance and weight' should be given to the setting of listed buildings. The report suggests that the level of harm to Brownsfield Mill is 'less than substantial', but no rationale is given. I suggest that it is substantial.

This is a matter of judgement. It would be easier to judge this matter if views from the western portion of Tariff St had been included in the design and access statement, e.g. the view from the Tariff Street / Dale St junction. It seems to me that the Mill would be hidden by the second block. At the very least, the committee should be provided with views of what Tariff St would look like from viewpoints on its western portion, looking east, before making a decision.

At the moment, a major contribution to the historic character of Tariff St is the fact that its western portion is dominated by views of Brownsfield Mill. I suggest that the character of this street would be very significantly changed by the erection of the second block.