



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

Statement of Case 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

27th March 2023

1. INTRODUCTION

The Appeal Development

1.1 This statement relates to an appeal made by Dandara Living Developments (“The Appellant”) against the decision of Manchester City Council (“The Council”) to refuse planning permission for the following development (‘The Proposal’):
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.

1.2 Planning application reference: 133746/FO/2022 was determined on the 2nd August 2022 and was refused on the following grounds:

- 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) 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) 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.

The Scope of Evidence

1.3 This statement seeks to set out the reasoning of the decision making in August 2022 and the subsequent review by the Council of updated evidence undertaken by the Appellant set out within their submitted statement of case and supporting

evidence provided to the Council as part of subsequent discussions following the production of their Statement of Case and evidence.

1.4 A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) by the parties has also been prepared to assist the Inspector further in conducting this appeal which sets out an agreed: description of the site; its context; description of the appeal proposals; and, the planning policy context. As such these matters are not repeated in this statement.

2. STATEMENT OF CASE

2.1 In assessing the appeal proposals the Council was concerned with the data used within the supporting Transport Statement and in particular the timing of the when the Country was moving out of significant Covid-19 restrictions.

2.2 As such it was considered that the timing of surveys and the evidence available to the Council at that time was that the surrounding highway network was subject to congestion under 'normal' operating conditions and that the application proposals would exacerbate this congestion to an unacceptable level.

2.3 In addition to the concerns around congestion of the highway network, the Council was of the view, that surrounding residential roads were subject to on-street car parking pressures arising from a range of locational reasons. As such the level of car parking to be provided on site together was considered to lead to potential displacement with development related parking taking place on these roads.

2.4 The consequence of the form of development proposed was considered to give rise to harm in terms of highway congestion in the vicinity of the site and car parking demands being displaced onto surrounding residential streets which were reflected in the three reasons for refusal.

Further evidence provided by the appellant post decision making

2.5 As part of the Statement of Case and supporting evidence the appellant has undertaken further highway survey work in the form of a Manual Occupancy and Capacity Survey conducted in November 2022, LinSig modelling work and an independent audit of this work undertaken by JCT Consultancy conducted in February 2023. This additional work has been provided to the Council and has been

subject of review and discussion between the parties since the production of the appellants appeal documents.

3. CONCLUSION

3.1 The conclusion of the Council is that the additional information and evidence provided by the appellant has demonstrated that the appeal proposals would not give rise to unacceptable impacts on congestion on the highway network.

Furthermore the car parking occupancy survey work demonstrates that when taken together with the measures to be put in place as part of the development and as indicated by the appellant which includes travel planning and cycle parking provision, is that the proposals would not give rise to harmful levels of development related parking on nearby residential streets.

3.2 As a result of the above and 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.