

# 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: This objection is not one of anti-development on the site; quite the opposite. As a resident in a neighbouring residential building, I welcome development in the area and have no issue with Block 1 as proposed. I do however, raise specific objection to the erection of Block 2 - which comprises a 12 storey building on a small parcel of land. Block 2 goes against local and national Planning Policy and should not be allowed for the following reasons: significant deviation to The Piccadilly Basin SRF design and provisions, diverts from the approved design within the Affinity Living Port Street development that was recently approved by MCC planning committee, will cause avoidable harm to the setting of Brownsfield Mill (grade II\*) and significantly impacts daylight of neighbouring residential buildings. In particular:

- Diversion from The Piccadilly Basin SRF:

- o The land on which it is proposed to build Block 2 is partly public space according to the Piccadilly Basin SRF.

- o SRF stipulates the erection of one building up to 10 storeys on Tariff Street close to the Rochdale Canal. Contrary to this, the proposal suggests the erection of a second building (Block 2) at 12-storey height.

- The recently approved Port Street development clearly stated the intention to build a pedestrian and visual corridor connecting Great Ancoats Street with Tariff Street and the city centre. If Block 2 is allowed to be built at its proposed location it would completely block this corridor.

- If Block 2 is built, it will completely block south-western (city centre) views of Avro which is a grade II\* listed building. Block 2 will cause considerable harm to its setting and its relationship with the Northern Quarter. The inclusion of Block 2 will sever this historic relationship (depicted in figure 3.12 of the applications heritage statement), leaving the listed mill completely isolated. In accordance with the 1990 (Planning Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act, 'great weight' should be afforded to the setting of listed buildings, with greater weight being applied to high grade buildings. The Act goes on to state that where harm can be avoided, the LPA should require developers to minimise and avoid such harm. The current application, specifically the erection of Block 2, will result in some clear and avoidable harm, which goes against the requirements embodied within the NPPF and policy EN3 (Manchester City Council core strategy 2012) this should be taken into due consideration at planning committee.

- Block 2 will have a material and disproportionate impact on the provision of daylight and sunlight to the Avro apartments on the annex side of the building. Please note that the apartments on the annex side do not get any direct sunlight in the morning hours since they are in the shade of the main Avro building. The only time of the day these apartments get any sunlight is during the afternoon. Block 2 will completely block sunlight to these apartments. The submitted daylight & sunlight report omits this point.

For the reason outlined above, I ask the planning committee to reject the application in its current state and invite the developer to return with an application for Block 1 only. The space for the proposed Block 2 should be used for public realm/green space as per The Piccadilly Basin SRF and the approved public realm as agreed within the Port Street Development. Should this approach be challenged by the developer due to its economic viability, I would argue adding additional height to Block 1 should be explored before the removal of public realm from the scheme (as well as the impact on the lives of neighbouring residents and heritage assets outlined above).