

Comments for Planning Application 135647/FO/2022

Application Summary

Application Number: 135647/FO/2022

Address: 550 Mauldeth Road West Manchester M21 7AA

Proposal: Erection of a new Lidl foodstore (Use Class E) with associated car parking and landscaping

Case Officer: Jennifer Connor

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: I object to this application due to its effect on a listed building, Hough End Hall. I have no objection in principle to the redevelopment of the site, however I believe that the proposed design is of insufficient quality and inappropriate for the setting of a Grade II* listed building.

The Heritage Statement admits that the proposal will sit negatively within the setting of a highly listed asset". It goes on to say that "in planning terms the removal of Lowry House and the associated proposal offers a significant reduction in height and massing to the existing Lowry House and will enhance the significance of the site of Hough End Hall."

However it is the removal of Lowry House that provides the benefit, and while this is a precondition of the proposed development, the demolition of Lowry House is in planning terms a separate matter (134169/DEM/2022 | Prior Notification for the demolition of Lowry House).

The design of the new building is not wholly inappropriate. However the oversailing external canopy of the roof to the north-west side results in the roof having maximum rather than minimum possible height adjacent to Hough End Hall. This means that the side of the Hall has to be viewed through the glazing of the new building, whereas part of it could be seen this is inappropriate. It's not really clear why this side of the building has to be so high at all, as there is not any accommodation or plant at height as far as can be understood from the drawings.

The design of the wall of the north-west elevation is relatively unrelieved and does not live up to the claim in the Design and Access Statement that "it provides animation and visual interest". The repeated panels of feature band brickwork are unvaried and hence do not count as visual interest. This is not the quality of facade required adjacent to a Grade II* listed building.

The EIA Screening Opinion states that "The replacement structure will be on a similar footprint to the existing Lowry House but will be considerably lower in height and massing." However Drawing XX-XX-DR-A-91002 shows that the footprint of Lowry House (shown as existing building to be demolished" is substantially smaller than the new building. In the Design and Access Statement the scale of the proposed development is solely justified in relation to the height of Lowry House. The footprint of the new building is clearly out of keeping with Hough End Hall and there is no attempt to justify this. I don't irrevocably object to a footprint of this size due to other relatively recent precedent in the vicinity of Hough End Hall, but I don't believe that the applicant has sufficiently justified why a building of this size is appropriate for this site.

In conclusion I believe the design set out in this application needs to be significantly improved before it is appropriate for this site.