

**APPENDIX 23 – Correspondence with Appellants Agent
during consideration of application**

Cadent and National Grid Plant Enquiry Response - Your Ref: 129020/FO/2020

Robert Griffin <robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk>

Tue 19/01/2021 09:39

To: Jenny Fryer <jenny.fryer@turley.co.uk>

 1 attachments (985 KB)

NATIONAL_GRID_NW_GW1B_3NWP_027536_1_13640.pdf;

Dear Jenny

FYI

Please find attached the response of Cadent Gas to the above planning application .

Kind regards

Rob Griffin
Principal Planner
Development Management South
Planning, Licensing and Building Control
Growth and Development Directorate
Manchester City Council
PO Box 532
Manchester
M60 2LA

T: 0161 234 4527

e: robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk

From: .box.PPRSTeam <PPRSTeam@cadentgas.com>

Sent: 14 January 2021 09:03

To: Robert Griffin <robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: [EXT] Cadent and National Grid Plant Enquiry Response - Your Ref: 129020/FO/2020(sp) Our Ref: NW_GW1B_3NWP_027536

****DO NOT REPLY TO THIS MAILBOX AS IT IS NOT MONITORED****

Re: 129020/FO/2020 - USDAW

Robert Griffin <robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk>

Wed 27/01/2021 09:57

To: Jenny Fryer <jenny.fryer@turley.co.uk>

Hi Jenny,

Thanks for your email.

I would usually provide a summary of neighbour responses, copies to view aren't available until 5 days before a committee or if delegated post a decision. I currently have 21 objections from residents and anticipate further responses over the next week or so. The main issues arising relate to impacts on the park, unsustainable impacts on the local community, car parking, over development and that the proposals are too tall for the area.

I have a number of consultee responses and again will look to provide a summary of these shortly.

Kind regards

Rob Griffin
Principal Planner
Development Management South
Planning, Licensing and Building Control
Growth and Development Directorate
Manchester City Council
PO Box 532
Manchester
M60 2LA

T: 0161 234 4527

e: robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk

From: Jenny Fryer <jenny.fryer@turley.co.uk>

Sent: 26 January 2021 19:03

To: Robert Griffin <robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk>

Subject: 129020/FO/2020 - USDAW

Hi Rob

I know prior to Covid MCC weren't sharing resident consultation responses online or by email and you had to go to your offices to view any comments; is this still the case?

Have you received any further statutory consultee responses?

Thanks

Kind regards

Jenny

Re: 129020/FO/2020 - USDAW

Robert Griffin <robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk>

Tue 23/02/2021 13:46

To: Jenny Fryer <jenny.fryer@turley.co.uk>

Bcc: Des Jones <des.jones@manchester.gov.uk>

Hi Jenny

Apologies, I am still awaiting a couple of responses and when these are with me I will let you know. In the meantime here is a short summary note of the statutory consultee responses and the level of objections received and short scope of the responses to the proposals.

Regards

Rob Griffin
Principal Planner
Development Management South
Planning, Licensing and Building Control
Growth and Development Directorate
Manchester City Council
PO Box 532
Manchester
M60 2LA

T: 0161 234 4527

e: robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk

From: Jenny Fryer <jenny.fryer@turley.co.uk>

Sent: 23 February 2021 12:30

To: Robert Griffin <robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: 129020/FO/2020 - USDAW

Dear Rob

We have a team call tomorrow morning so it would be really useful if we could update the client on consultation response, I know that's going to be his first questions. Have you been able to get them in an order to send across?

Many thanks

Kind regards
Jenny

Jenny Fryer
Senior Planner

Turley

COPY OF CONSULTEE RESPONSE NOTE SENT AND REFERENCED IN EMAIL SEE BELOW

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit –

Bats

Buildings and trees on site were surveyed by an experience consultancy, for bat roosting potential and one emergence survey, late in the survey season carried out on one building. No evidence of bats was found with all buildings proposed for demolition assessed as having negligible bat roosting potential, with the building for retention assessed as moderate risk, downgraded to low risk following the emergence survey owing to a high level of external lighting. In addition, as this building with low to moderate potential is to be retained, reasonable avoidance measures can be applied. GMEU recommend a condition along the following lines is applied to any permission.

Works associated with the building to be retained including demolition of extensions shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the Ecological Appraisal, Bowland Ecology reference BOW17/1126 Section 5.7 as already submitted with the planning application and agreed in principle with the LPA prior to determination. If works associated with this building are not commenced prior to 1st May 2022 an additional emergence survey will be carried out.

In addition, three trees proposed for removal were assessed as having low bat roosting potential and requiring further survey. Labelled as BT4 a semi-mature yew, BT5 a holly and BT7 a semi-mature yew, in the ecological report. Given they are low risk further and based on the photographs GMEU are content for further assessment to occur via condition along the following lines.

The removal of tree called BT4, BT5 and BT7 may have the potential to cause harm to bats as identified in the Bowland Ecology reference BOW17/1126 sections 5.8 and appendix E and shall not in any circumstances occur unless further information on the risk potential to bats has been provided to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority

Nesting Birds

Trees and shrubs will be lost as a result of the development, potential bird nesting habitat. All British birds' nests and eggs (with certain limited exceptions) are protected by Section 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, as amended. GMEU recommend a condition along the following lines be applied to any permission.

No works to trees or shrubs shall occur between the 1st March and 31st August in any year unless a detailed bird nest survey by a suitably experienced ecologist has been carried out immediately prior to clearance and written confirmation provided that no active bird nests are present which has been agreed in writing by the LPA.

Mammals

Habitats on site were assessed as providing potential nesting habitat for hedgehog and grey squirrel dreys were recorded in some of the trees on the site.

Hedgehog are a UK Biodiversity priority species and therefore a material consideration. GMEU recommend a condition along the following lines is applied to any permission.

Prior to any earthworks a reasonable avoidance measures method statement for hedgehogs shall be supplied to and agreed in writing by the LPA

Grey squirrels are included within schedule 9 part 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) ie they are regarded as a pest species. However, it is still illegal to cause them unnecessary suffering. ie any control has to be humane. Felling a tree with an occupied drey would be an offence under the Wild Mammal (Protection) Act 1996. GMEU recommend an informative along the following lines is applied to any permission.

The applicant is reminded that, under the Wild Mammal (Protection) Act 1996 it is an offence to inflict unnecessary suffering to wild mammals. Planning consent does not provide a defence against prosecution under this act.

Invasive Species

Rhododendron was recorded on the site. Rhododendron ponticum is included within schedule 9 part 2 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, as amended. It is an offence to introduce or cause to grow wild any plant listed under this schedule.

It is quite probable that the Rhododendron on site are ornamental varieties not included under schedule 9 part 2. They are also unlike japanese knotweed unlikely to propagate from plant fragments or to have a seed bank within the soil like himalayan balsam, plus it is not illegal to grow rhododendron on a site such as this. GMEU are therefore satisfied that the risks of an offence are very low and can be covered by an informative along the following lines.

It is an offence under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, as amended to introduce, plant or cause to grow wild any plant listed in Schedule 9 part 2 of the Act. Species such as Rhododendron ponticum (purple flowered species) are included within this schedule. If any Rhododendron or soil contaminated with Rhododendron is to be taken off site a suitably experienced consultant should be employed to advise on how to avoid an offence.

Contributing to and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Section 170 of the NPPF 2019 states that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. The main ecological impacts are loss of trees, loss of associated bird nesting habitat and loss of associated bat foraging habitat. (The site had high levels of common pipistrelle activity associated with the trees). Replacement tree planting should therefore be provided to mitigate for tree loss and in the long term restore bat foraging and bird nesting habitat.

Significant levels of new tree planting are proposed along the boundaries, as well as other planting that will be an improvement ecologically even if ornamental on the existing habitats on site. The proposals are likely to be adequate to mitigate and enhance the site in the long term and includes some native species such as beech and field maple. GMEU would however recommend that the ecological value is improved further by substituting non-native birches with silver birch (*B. pendula*).

In terms of the short-term mitigation whilst the trees mature, GMEU recommend provision of bird boxes on mature retained trees for typical urban/suburban species and to enhance the site for foraging bat by ensuring that any new external lighting has less unnecessary impacts than the

existing external lighting on the retained trees and retained building. The details can be conditioned via a landscape condition and a separate external lighting strategy condition along the following lines.

Prior to development an external lighting strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The strategy shall:

- *Identify areas/features on site that are potentially sensitive to lighting for bats;*
- *show how and where lighting will be installed and through appropriate lighting contour plans demonstrated clearly that any impacts on bats is negligible/less than that previously present on site;*
- *Specify frequency and duration of use.*

MCC Highway Services –

A high level of on-street parking has been observed on Langley Road during University term time, associated with the terraced properties. The route is subject to a 20mph speed limit, there are junction protection restrictions at Langley Road's junction with Wilmslow Road.

Access

Vehicular access to the Application Site is currently afforded via Langley Road. A new emergency access vehicular access point is also proposed to be provided to Langley Road.

The existing service vehicle access off Langley Road that services the office building would be closed and reinstated to footway. The dropped kerb adjacent to bus stop that previously allowed egress from the site should also be reinstated. Any changes to the adopted highway including reinstatements and new dropped crossings should be taken forward via a suitable highway agreement (S278). Dropped kerbs and tactile paving should be provided across the vehicle access points.

Any proposed gates should open inwards and not impact adopted footway. Barrier controls should be located a minimum 5m from the edge of the carriageway so waiting vehicles do not impede through traffic.

At the point of vehicle egress, any boundary treatment should be visually permeable from 600mm upwards.

Highway Safety

The accident information provided covered the most recent five-year period available from the database (01/11/2014 - 31/10/2019).

There have been a notable number of accidents involving cyclists in the area. There are 12 recorded incidents at the junction of Moseley Road and Wilmslow Road.

The proposed development will be adding additional cycle trips to the local network. It is recommended that the applicant review the layout of this junction in light of this high accident rate and fund measures to improve safety at the junction for all users and particularly cyclists. This should be conditioned.

Trip generation

The existing site operates as an office with circa 180 staff and 53 on-site parking spaces.

The TRICS database has been used to predict that the existing office use has the potential to generate circa 55 two-way vehicle movements during the AM peak hour and 44 twoway during the PM peak hour.

The information provided has been reviewed by TfGM and they have not raised any concerns regarding predicted trips.

Car Parking

Eight car parking spaces are proposed on-site

- 3 accessible spaces for students and staff
- 4 standard bays with electric vehicle charging points
- 1 standard bay.

The standard bays should be minimum 2.4m wide x 4.8m length and the accessible bays should be 3.6m wide x 6.0m length - bays should be separated by a 6m aisle width.

CAR CLUB BAY

As there is no on-site car parking facility for student residents it is recommended that a car club bay is located nearby to the development and this is funded by the Developer. This will discourage car ownership and also assist residents who may require occasional use of a vehicle.

Student Parking Management Strategy

It is noted that a strategy is proposed so Students would not be permitted to bring their own cars to the site (or to the University) as a condition of their tenancy, this is welcomed. This strategy should be conditioned.

Move-in/out Procedure

It is noted that all on-site car parking would be made available for students moving into/out of the site at the start/end of term time and demand for on-site parking during move-in / move-out events would be managed by the site operator. It is recommended that a Condition is attached to any subsequent Planning permission requesting that an Operational Management Plan is submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, prior to first occupation of the development.

Pedestrians

It is proposed that the existing site access from Wilmslow Road would be used by pedestrians. An additional new pedestrian access point is proposed at the south-eastern corner of the Site off Langley Road, close to its junction with Wilmslow Road. It is recommended that all pedestrian routes are minimum 2m wide.

To assist pedestrians and enhance road safety it is queried if any consideration has been given to the provision of signalised pedestrian facilities across Wilmslow Road in the vicinity of the site. A facility could be incorporated into the bus gate signals.

Public Realm/Materials

Commuted sums are required for any non-standard materials, street trees etc used on the adopted highway. To be agreed with MCC Highways S278 team as required.

Cycle Storage

Cycle stores for circa 172 cycles are proposed within the basement with access from the

main pedestrian access off Wilmslow Road. A further 42 spaces are proposed close to the Wilmslow Road access. This represents a 50% allocation. The applicant should monitor usage of the cycle storage and provide additional as required - this should be included in the conditioned Travel Plan.

It is also recommended that the Developer promotes additional schemes to encourage sustainable travel such as bicycle hire etc.

TAXI PICK-UP and DROP-OFF

No detail has been provided regarding this activity, details of a suitable location and how this will be managed should be included in the site management plan.

Waste/Servicing

It is proposed that servicing would be undertaken on-street on Langley Street and also within the car parking area.

Swept path assessments of refuse collection / delivery vehicle manoeuvres are provided which are acceptable in principle, to ensure servicing is appropriately managed it is recommended that a servicing management plan is conditioned.

Travel Plan

A draft Interim Travel Plan has been prepared to accompany the planning application. This is acceptable in principle, and it is recommended that a Condition is attached to any subsequent Planning permission requesting that a Travel Plan is submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, prior to first occupation of the development.

CMP

A construction management methodology plan has been submitted with the application. This will require on-going discussion and agreement with the MCC Network Resilience team. It is recommended that a CMP is suitably conditioned.

The applicant is also advised that any requirements for licensing, hoarding / scaffolding and any associated temporary traffic management arrangements will need discussion and agreement with the council's Highways Applications and Network Resilience teams via Contact Manchester (Tel. 0161 234 5004).

Dilapidation surveys are also requested and the applicant should include photographs and commentary on the condition of carriageway / footways on construction vehicle routes surrounding the site.

Suggested Conditions

- Cycle parking
- Student Management Strategy including Move in/out procedure
- Servicing Management Plan
- Off Site Highways highway safety at Mosely Road junction, reinstatements, etc.
- CMP
- Travel Plan
- Car Club Bay
- ELV

MCC as LLFA

Recommend the following conditions:

Condition 1: No development shall take place until surface water drainage works have been implemented in accordance with Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (March 2015) or any subsequent replacements national standards and details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- Evidence that the EA have been consulted on the drainage strategy as the proposed development lies within a SPZ3.
- Details of surface water attenuation that offers a reduction in surface water runoff rate in line with the Manchester Trafford and Salford Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, i.e. at least a 50% reduction in runoff rate compared to the existing rates, as the site is located within Conurbation Core Critical Drainage Area. 50% betterment should be calculated using discharge rates of the surveyed existing drainage system, not the modified rational method.
- Consideration of green SuDS components, e.g. rain gardens, which could be achieved by SuDS-enabling some of the vegetation already included in the landscape proposal.
- Runoff volume in the 1 in 100 year, 6 hours rainfall shall be constrained to a value as close as is reasonable practicable to the greenfield runoff volume for the same event, but never to exceed the runoff volume from the development site prior to redevelopment;
- Evidence that the drainage system has been designed (unless an area is designated to hold and/or convey water as part of the design) so that flooding does not occur during a 1 in 100 year rainfall event with allowance for climate change in any part of a building. This should demonstrate how any flooded volume from system surcharge would be safely managed on site.
- Hydraulic calculation of the proposed drainage system (with updated 50% betterment calculation);
- Where surface water is connected to the public sewer, agreement in principle from United Utilities is required that there is adequate spare capacity in the existing system taking future development requirements into account. An email of acceptance of proposed flows and/or new connection will suffice.
- Construction details of flow control and SuDS elements.

Reason: To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution. This condition is imposed in light of national policies within the NPPF and NPPG and local policies EN08 and EN14.

If there is no clear adoption policy in place to take over the proposed drainage system after construction, the LLFA suggest the following construction and maintenance condition to be considered by the LPA:

Condition 2: No development hereby permitted shall be occupied until details of the implementation, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details. Those details shall include:

- Verification report providing photographic evidence of construction as per design drawings;

- As built construction drawings if different from design construction drawings;
- Management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime. This should include required maintenance tasks for all drainage components, including a schedule to prevent blockage of the detention basin inlet/outlet.

Reason: To manage flooding and pollution and to ensure that a managing body is in place for the sustainable drainage system and there is funding and maintenance mechanism for the lifetime of the development

GMP - Recommend that a condition to reflect the physical security specifications set out in section four of the Crime Impact Statement should be added, if the application is to be approved.

United Utilities – Recommend conditions to cover drainage.

EA - Environment Agency Commentary

Due to current internal resource constraints, our Groundwater and Contaminated Land Team has not been able undertaken a review of the risk posed by the proposed development to controlled waters. We would therefore advise that you refer to our published Guiding Principles for Land Contamination which outlines the approach we would wish to see adopted to managing risks to the water environment from this site and consult with your Environmental Health / Environmental Protection Department for further detailed advice.

Where planning controls are considered necessary we would recommend that you seek to integrate any requirements for human health protection with those for protection of the water environment. This approach is supported by Paragraph 170 (e and f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Further to the above, please see outlined below several informatives which should be considered and used to inform/advise development going forward.

Local Planning Authority (LPA) Informative - Contaminated Land Investigation / Remediation

The NPPF takes a precautionary approach to land contamination. Before the principle of development can be determined, land contamination should be investigated to see whether it could preclude certain development due to environmental risk or cost of remediation.

Where contamination is known or suspected, a desk study, site investigation, remediation and other works may be required to enable safe development. The minimum requirements for submission with a planning application are a preliminary risk assessment, such as a site walkover or desk top study.

Site investigation and remediation strategy reports may be required for submission with a planning application for sensitive land use types or where significant contamination, or uncertainty, is found. When dealing with land affected by contamination, developers should follow refer initially to the following guidance: <https://www.gov.uk/contaminated-land>

Neighbour notification responses

I am also in receipt of 234 objections to the proposals and objections from a number of local Civic Societies, residents and other interest groups, and from ward Councillors.

Many of the comments raise concerns with the scale and height of the proposals; visual impacts on park and surrounding area; overshadowing of the park and specific elements/ gardens within it; the inappropriateness of the design; loss of light and overbearing impacts on existing residential properties; lack of car parking to serve the proposed level of development, impact on the retained Oakley House building by virtue of the scale and massing of the proposed buildings. Given the volume of responses this is only a cursory summary of the issues raised at this time.

In addition to these matters arising from the physical aspects of the proposals a majority of comments indicate that further student accommodation in Fallowfield is unwanted and will undermine the sustainability of the neighbourhood and permanent residents in the area. Many examples of current problems associated with student behaviour such as impacts on services, waste disposal, litter, noise and disturbance at anti social hours, more recent issues arising from student behaviour during lockdown and non-compliance with Covid 19 regulations and that these proposals and additional numbers of students in the area will exacerbate these issues. It is raised that the proposals are not aligned with recent reports of the Council regarding the locations for PBSA.

I am still awaiting a number of other responses from consultees I am seeking an understanding of when I might receive these and will supply a summary of these when I have them.

Planning application reference 129020/FO/2020 - 188 Wilmslow Road

Robert Griffin <robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk>

Tue 09/03/2021 11:45

To: Jenny Fryer <jenny.fryer@turley.co.uk>

Cc: Des Jones <des.jones@manchester.gov.uk>

Dear Jenny

I wanted to provide you with an update on the above application and our consideration of the proposals following the notification process.

As previously provided to you the proposals have generated a large amount of objections from local residents, community groups and local Councillors. These comments have raised a number of concerns relating to the proposals such as the increase in number of student bedspaces and the impacts this would have on the sustainability of the wider community and the neighbourhood. Other concerns in terms of the built form, height and scale of the proposed development have also been raised.

The Council as LPA shares the concerns that have been raised through the notification process and does not consider it is in a position to support the principle of the proposals for student accommodation in Fallowfield at this location or the design response to the site together with the impacts it would have on the character of the area. As such, given the fundamental concerns to the principle of the development and unless your clients wishes to withdraw the application, we would look to take forward a recommendation to refuse the application to the Committee meeting to be held on 15th April 2021.

Given the position outlined above we do not believe the meeting scheduled for tomorrow would be of a value at this time.

Kind regards

Rob Griffin
Principal Planner
Development Management South
Planning, Licensing and Building Control
Growth and Development Directorate
Manchester City Council
PO Box 532
Manchester
M60 2LA

e: robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk

Re: Planning application reference 129020/FO/2020 - 188 Wilmslow Road

Robert Griffin <robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk>

Tue 09/03/2021 15:45

To: Stephen Bell <stephen.bell@turley.co.uk>

Cc: Des Jones <des.jones@manchester.gov.uk>; Jenny Fryer <jenny.fryer@turley.co.uk>

Dear Stephen,

Thanks for your email.

I would refer to the initial discussions in relation to this matter in 2020 where it was indicated that the principle of student accommodation was one that gave rise to concerns in this location and one that could not be supported. It was made clear that the more recent discussions did not relate to support for the principle of the use at this location which we indicated would be extremely controversial and we were in no way providing you with any comfort that the application would be supported. The submitted scheme and supporting documentation are not considered to have resolved those concerns in terms of principle or the scale and massing and form of development that enables that use. As such and given this, refinements to the scheme in order for it to be of an acceptable form are not considered to be feasible. On this basis it is not considered that a meeting is required to discuss this matter any further.

It is noted that the application was submitted with a letter from the University of Manchester supporting the scheme, their views on the proposals are of course important in considering the scheme against the criteria set out in policy H12 and we will reflect that in our report to Committee and any further response they might provide to us.

Kind regards

Rob Griffin
Principal Planner
Development Management South
Planning, Licensing and Building Control
Growth and Development Directorate
Manchester City Council
PO Box 532
Manchester
M60 2LA

e: robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk

From: Stephen Bell <stephen.bell@turley.co.uk>

Sent: 09 March 2021 12:28

To: Robert Griffin <robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk>

Cc: Des Jones <des.jones@manchester.gov.uk>; Jenny Fryer <jenny.fryer@turley.co.uk>; 'Iain Smith' <Iain.Smith@WatkinJones.com>; 'Barry Coltrini' <Barry.Coltrini@watkinjones.com>; David Taylor <David.Taylor@watkinjones.com>

Subject: FW: Planning application reference 129020/FO/2020 - 188 Wilmslow Road

Good afternoon Rob,

Thanks for your email below, which Jenny has passed on.

Our client is naturally disappointed with the intended recommendation for refusal bearing in mind discussions to date. My instructions are that the application will not be withdrawn, but that we wish to seek to minimise issues of disagreement. We note the position on the principle of development but it is only reasonable that the applicant is given opportunity to understand the reasoning behind that position, and to appraise whether further evidence may influence that position. Equally, the other matters you raise may be capable of being addressed or mitigated through refinements to the project. It is to be expected that the applicant is given opportunity to understand what the specific concerns are and to consider whether those concerns may be overcome.

We would therefore request that the meeting tomorrow still takes place such that these matters can be adequately and fairly explored.

We also understand that the University of Manchester has not yet formally responded to the application notification, as it was directed to an email which is now longer active. We are advised that the University will reiterate its support as expressed in the application material. Again the applicant would wish to understand how this position has been or will be taken in to account in reaching an in-principle recommendation against.

Thanks
Steve

Stephen Bell
Senior Director, Head of Planning North

Turley

1 New York Street
Manchester M1 4HD
T 0161 233 7676
M 07880 200 867
D 0161 233 7645

We are a CarbonNeutral® certified company.

We are working remotely wherever possible in line with Government guidance. Our co-owners are contactable in the usual ways and we suggest using mobile numbers in the first instance.

We support blended flexible working which means that co-owners will respond to you during their working hours and we appreciate that you will respond during your own working hours.

turley.co.uk

Fw: Planning application reference 129020/FO/2020 - 188 Wilmslow Road

Robert Griffin <robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk>

Wed 17/03/2021 13:10

To: Stephen Bell <stephen.bell@turley.co.uk>

Cc: Des Jones <des.jones@manchester.gov.uk>; Dave Roscoe <dave.roscoe@manchester.gov.uk>; Jenny Fryer <jenny.fryer@turley.co.uk>

Dear Stephen

Further to your email, I respond as follows.

In accordance with the Councils adopted Statement of Community Involvement we do not make public copies of responses received during the notification process of dealing with an application until either a decision has been issued under delegated authority or 5 working days prior to a Committee where an application is to be reported. I am able to provide a summary of responses and this has previously been provided from residents, councillors, and statutory consultee responses. I have a response still outstanding from the Councils Environmental Health Team, once I have this I will let you and Jenny know.

Since my last email I have received a further 4 resident objections and comments from a local school, these raise similar points to those in the summary previously provided.

I have also received comments from the Councils Arborists who raise no objections to the proposals from an arboricultural point of view and Highways Services have responded to the note provided to us from Focus to indicate that they would not pursue the points they made relating to the crossing and safety review.

In response to the Council's notification process of the application I am in receipt of a letter from a local MP indicating that constituents have asked that he write in response to the submitted application to ask that the Planning committee take into account a number of matters in coming to a decision including: taking an appropriate and fair consideration of views submitted by all local residents as well and representative organisations and institutions; to consider, based on evidence submitted, the balance of the community in the Fallowfield and Rusholme Wards and especially within the immediate area of the Fallowfield Brow; to consider the impacts on Platt Fields Park (particularly with respect to the area round Shakespearean Gardens and to trees within the park) and whether appropriate action has been taken to mitigate any impacts on park users; to come to a decision, taking into account all views and evidence, that is in accordance with the law and Manchester City Council's planning policies.

The letter you attached to your email is noted but wasn't received in response to our notification process and is dated prior to the submission of the current application proposals. It was, therefore, not my intention to reference it in our reporting of the application unless I have a specific request from its author to append it to our file.

In terms of the scheme presented in the application, the density and proposed numbers of occupiers gives rise to significant concerns in terms of impacts on residents and are not considered to contribute towards the Councils overarching key spatial principle to create neighbourhoods of choice or provide a positive contribution to the area. In terms of policy H12 it is considered that the proposals would not contribute in a positive way to the vibrancy of Fallowfield, nor have a positive regeneration impact and would increase pressure on existing neighbourhood services to the detriment of existing residents. The level of increase in number of student occupation would give rise to risks of increase in crime and anti-social behaviour within the Fallowfield area. In addition to these points the level of development and occupation are also considered to give rise to increases in parking pressures on surrounding streets.

The level of proposed accommodation and the significant built form required to accommodate it in terms of height, scale and footprint fails to reflect the character of the sites location in this part of Fallowfield or is respectful of its relationship to Platt Fields Park.

Kind regards

Rob Griffin
Principal Planner
Development Management South
Planning, Licensing and Building Control
Growth and Development Directorate
Manchester City Council
PO Box 532
Manchester
M60 2LA

T: 0161 234 4527

e: robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk

From: Stephen Bell <stephen.bell@turley.co.uk>

Sent: 15 March 2021 11:29

To: Robert Griffin <robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk>

Cc: Des Jones <des.jones@manchester.gov.uk>; Dave Roscoe <dave.roscoe@manchester.gov.uk>; Ben Wrighton <Ben.Wrighton@watkinjones.com>; Iain Smith <Iain.Smith@WatkinJones.com>; Jenny Fryer <jenny.fryer@turley.co.uk>

Subject: Planning application reference 129020/FO/2020 - 188 Wilmslow Road

Good morning Rob,

Further to our meeting with Dave Roscoe this morning, we would be grateful if you could provide the following:

- Copies of letters received from local Cllrs in response to the application;
- Copies of statutory consultee responses that we have not been supplied to date, together with confirmation of whether any are outstanding;
- Copies of other responses, but if this isn't possible, otherwise summaries of the points raised;
- Clarification of your position on matters beyond the principle of use, in particular the apparent (from your earlier emails) concerns around scale and massing. It is important the applicant is able to understand what the issues are and be given the opportunity to consider how they may be overcome;
- Clarification of why as officers you consider the proposal to be in conflict with Policy H12 (which criteria do we fall foul of and why). Again, it is important for the applicant to understand this, to establish whether further evidence could be supplied.

One additional point which we didn't discuss with Dave relates to the position of local MPs. We understand the attached letter was issued to Dave in October, in advance of the application being submitted. I'd be grateful if you could confirm that this letter has been placed on the application file and will be taken in to account. Also, we understand Jeff Smith MP has written in support of the application and we would appreciate confirmation this has been received.

Fw: Planning application reference 129020/FO/2020 - 188 Wilmslow Road

Robert Griffin <robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk>

Tue 23/03/2021 09:31

To: Stephen Bell <stephen.bell@turley.co.uk>

Cc: Jenny Fryer <jenny.fryer@turley.co.uk>; Des Jones <des.jones@manchester.gov.uk>; Dave Roscoe <dave.roscoe@manchester.gov.uk>

Dear Stephen ,

I hope you are well.

Further to your email, I have now received comments back from Environmental Health who have recommended several conditions but have also commented on some of the information provided. These are set out below:

CMP (Condition)

The construction Management Plan is acceptable apart from the proposed construction hours for Saturdays are not in accordance with the MCC guidance as they intend on starting at 08:00hrs.

*The applicant should refer to https://secure.manchester.gov.uk/info/100006/environmental_problems/2956/noise/9 and IAQM/EPUK Construction Guidance at: <http://iaqm.co.uk/guidance/>

Deliveries to commercial premises (condition)

Deliveries, servicing and collections, including waste collections shall not take place outside the following hours: 07:30 to 20:00, Monday to Saturday, no deliveries/waste collections on Sundays/Bank Holidays.

External Lighting Scheme (condition)

a) Before the use hereby approved commences external lighting shall be designed and installed in accordance with a scheme approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority so as to control glare and overspill onto nearby residential properties.

b) Prior to occupation of the development a verification report will be required to validate that the work undertaken throughout the development conforms to the recommendations and requirements in the approved light consultant's report. The report shall also undertake post completion testing to confirm that acceptable criteria have been met. Any instances of non-conformity with the recommendations in the report shall be detailed along with any measures required to ensure compliance with the criteria.

Noise (condition)

a) Before the development commences a scheme for acoustically insulating the proposed residential accommodation against noise from Wilmslow Road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. There may be other actual or potential sources of noise which require consideration on or near the site, including any local commercial/industrial premises. The approved noise insulation scheme shall be completed before any of the dwelling units are occupied.

Noise survey data must include measurements taken during a rush-hour period and night time to determine the appropriate sound insulation measures necessary. The following noise criteria will be required to be achieved:

Bedrooms (night time - 23.00 - 07.00)	30 dB LAeq (individual noise events shall not exceed 45 dB LAmax,F by more than 15 times)
Living Rooms (daytime - 07.00 - 23.00)	35 dB LAeq
Gardens and terraces (daytime)	55 dB LAeq

b) Prior to first occupation of the residential units, a verification report will be required to validate that the work undertaken throughout the development conforms to the recommendations and requirements in the approved acoustic consultant's report. The report shall also undertake post completion testing to confirm that the internal noise criteria have been met. Any instances of non-conformity with the recommendations in the report shall be detailed along with any measures required to ensure compliance with the internal noise criteria.

Reason: To secure a reduction in noise from traffic or other sources in order to protect future residents from noise disturbance.

The PDA Acoustic report reference J003148/4667/3/TD dated 18 December 2020 said that "It should be noted that building envelope and façade design details for the proposed development are currently unavailable. Therefore, calculated internal noise levels have been based on typical details for this type of development as described in Sections 5.2-5.3. Minimum acoustic specifications have been identified for the glazing and trickle ventilators".

The mitigation strategies detailed in section 5.4 of the acoustic report have been derived based on the results of the SP model and assumed details as described in Sections 5.2-5.3, to achieve the recommended internal noise level criteria as detailed in BS 8233 & WHO 1999.

If construction details vary from those detailed in the Acoustic Report the applicant will need to demonstrate that the MCC internal noise criteria will still be met.

EH have no objections to the external noise levels within the development, as there is an external area where the noise levels achieve 45-50dBA and there are outdoor amenity spaces within walking distance of the development.

We will require a verification report to demonstrate the internal noise levels have been achieved.

Noise – external equipment insulation (condition)

a) Externally mounted ancillary plant, equipment and servicing shall be selected and/or acoustically treated in accordance with a scheme designed so as to achieve a rating level of 5dB (LAeq) below the typical background (LA90) level at the nearest noise sensitive location. Prior to commencement of the use hereby approved the scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority in order to secure a reduction in the level of noise emanating from the site.

b) Prior to occupation of the development a verification report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority to validate that the work undertaken throughout the development conforms to the recommendations and requirements in the approved acoustic report.

The report shall also undertake post completion testing to confirm that the noise criteria have been met. Any instances of non-conformity with the recommendations in the report shall be detailed along with any measures required to ensure compliance with the agreed noise criteria.

Reason - To minimise the impact of the development and to prevent a general increase in pre-existing background noise levels around the site.

The planning statement mentions that the application site intends on using Air Source Heat Pumps for hot water and heating. The applicant should ensure that these and all other externally mounted plant will meet the MCC noise criteria

Waste (condition)

Before the development commences a scheme for the storage and disposal of refuse shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The details of the approved scheme shall be implemented as part of the development and shall remain in situ whilst the use or development is in operation.

New developments shall have refuse storage space for segregated waste collection and recycling. Internal and external storage areas are required.

Reason - In the interests of amenity and public health.

*The proforma/ Waste Management Strategy must include the following information:

- Estimated volumes and types of waste produced by the development;
- Details of internal and external stores for both waste and recycling, including any plans and designs;
- Location of the proposed collection point and details of the route the collection vehicle will take;
- Details of how waste will be transferred between stores and to the collection location; and
- Details of number and capacity of bins proposed and collection frequency.
- Other details as per 'Waste Proforma v1.0' - refer to guidance at:
http://www.manchester.gov.uk/downloads/download/6048/waste_management_strategy

The applicant has provided details of the total refuse storage space across the whole of the development, but EH are concerned that the storage space provided for the tower block is inadequate, the refuse stores appear to be roughly the same size in both buildings but the tower block will house considerably more students. There are also no details for the recycling provisions for the site. For Student accommodation we would assume 50L total waste per bedroom (general waste 28L per bedroom, rest recycling).

Air Quality(condition)

a) Prior to commencement of the development mitigation measures to safeguard local air quality shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

b) Prior to occupation of the development any agreed mitigation measures shall be implemented and verified as such in writing by the City Council as local planning authority and shall remain in situ whilst the use or development is in operation.

Reason: To secure a reduction in air pollution from traffic or other sources in order to protect existing and future residents from air pollution, pursuant to policies EN16, SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

*The Air Quality Assessment is accepted. The applicant is installing 4EV charge points (which should be a minimum of 7kW) as there are seven parking spaces in the development. In accordance with MCC's best practice recommendations, cable routes should be provided for the remaining parking spaces.

Contaminated land (condition)

a) Before the development hereby approved commences, a report (the Preliminary Risk Assessment) to identify and evaluate all potential sources and impacts of any ground contamination, groundwater contamination and/or ground gas relevant to the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The Preliminary Risk Assessment shall conform to City Council's current guidance document (Planning Guidance in Relation to Ground Contamination).

In the event of the Preliminary Risk Assessment identifying risks which in the written opinion of the Local Planning Authority require further investigation, the development shall not commence until a scheme for the investigation of the site and the identification of remediation measures (the Site Investigation Proposal) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

The measures for investigating the site identified in the Site Investigation Proposal shall be carried out, before development commences and a report prepared outlining what measures, if any, are required to remediate the land (the Site Investigation Report and/or Remediation Strategy) which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

b) When the development within each phase commences, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the previously agreed Remediation Strategy and a Completion/Verification Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

In the event that ground contamination, groundwater contamination and/or ground gas, not previously identified, are found to be present on the site at any time before the development in each phase is occupied, then development shall cease and/or the development shall not be occupied until, a report outlining what measures, if any, are required to remediate the land (the Revised Remediation Strategy) is submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the Revised Remediation Strategy, which shall take precedence over any Remediation Strategy or earlier Revised Remediation Strategy.

Reason - To ensure that the presence of or the potential for any contaminated land and/or groundwater is detected and appropriate remedial action is taken in the interests of public safety, pursuant to [INSERT] of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

The applicant has only supplied data for three rounds of gas monitoring. EH will need the missing data for the other three rounds of gas monitoring before they can comment on the suitability of the Contaminated Land report.

Information for Developers guidance documents can be downloaded using the following link:

http://www.manchester.gov.uk/info/500207/planning_and_regeneration/1962/additional_planning_guidance/3

I note your email that your client wishes an opportunity to respond to previous emailed comments and the Council does agree to your request to an extension of time until 30th June 2021. I will mark my file accordingly.

Kind regards

Rob Griffin
Principal Planner
Development Management South
Planning, Licensing and Building Control
Growth and Development Directorate
Manchester City Council
PO Box 532
Manchester
M60 2LA

T: 0161 234 4527

e: robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk

From: Stephen Bell <stephen.bell@turley.co.uk>

Sent: 19 March 2021 09:13

To: Robert Griffin <robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk>

Cc: Des Jones <des.jones@manchester.gov.uk>; Dave Roscoe <dave.roscoe@manchester.gov.uk>; Jenny Fryer <jenny.fryer@turley.co.uk>

Subject: RE: Planning application reference 129020/FO/2020 - 188 Wilmslow Road

Good morning Rob,

Thank you for your email below.

We are grateful for the additional information regarding responses to the consultation, and would appreciate you providing additional summaries as further responses are received. I note that the Environmental Health response is outstanding. Are you also expecting a response from the Council's conservation officer / consultant?

Your original emails and this further explanation raises a series of issues the applicant wishes to reflect on and consider a response to. We would therefore request on the applicant's behalf that the application is not reported to the Planning Committee of 15th April as you indicated was your intention. We understand the next available Committee meeting would be 3rd June. The applicant would agree to an extension of the period for determination to 30th June. I would be grateful if you could confirm this is acceptable to the authority and that the application will not be determined until the applicant has been provided opportunity to respond.

Kind regards

Steve

Stephen Bell
Senior Director, Head of Planning North

Turley

1 New York Street
Manchester M1 4HD
T 0161 233 7676
M 07880 200 867
D 0161 233 7645

We are a CarbonNeutral® certified company.

Re: 188 Wilmslow Road Ref: 129020/FO/2020 - Agreement of viewpoints for TVIA

Robert Griffin <robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk>

Wed 21/04/2021 17:46

To: Jenny Fryer <jenny.fryer@turley.co.uk>

Hi Jenny

I think the only follow up statutory consultee response was from EH following the additional information provided.

They have provided the following comments:-

1. We have looked at the gas monitoring results and agree that the site can be classed as CS1.
2. Asbestos has been identified on the site, and it does not appear that the site is being stripped in any way, so this will remain on the site for the duration of the work. I would therefore like information from the applicant on how those involved in the construction work are to be protected from the potential effects of working in an environment containing asbestos.
3. The outline remediation requirements for the land has said there will be a 600mm clean cover system, with a Terram-style geotextile membrane between the made ground and the imported material, in areas of soft landscaping. However we will require a finalised remediation strategy with full details of what is proposed including details of the removal of any contaminant hotspots mentioned in section 8.2. Human Health of the Tier consult report TE1279GIR1.2, and the sampling frequency for the imported soils once they are in-situ.
4. We would like a copy of the potable water risk assessment to ensure that suitable pipes are installed for the development as certain compounds can pass through plastic water pipes into the drinking water supply.

Regards

Rob Griffin

Principal Planner

Development Management South

Planning, Licensing and Building Control

Growth and Development Directorate

Manchester City Council

PO Box 532

Manchester

M60 2LA

T: 0161 234 4527

e: robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk

From: Jenny Fryer <jenny.fryer@turley.co.uk>

Sent: 21 April 2021 16:06

To: Robert Griffin <robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: 188 Wilmslow Road Ref: 129020/FO/2020 - Agreement of viewpoints for TVIA

Hi Rob

Sorry to email again, I'm just wanting to check in on whether or not there have been any other consultee responses we should be aware of?

Many thanks

Kind regards
Jenny

Jenny Fryer
Senior Planner

Turley

1 New York Street
Manchester M1 4HD
T 0161 233 7676
M 07980 867 615
D 0161 233 7675

We are a CarbonNeutral® certified company.

We are working remotely wherever possible in line with Government guidance. Our co-owners are contactable in the usual ways and we suggest using mobile numbers in the first instance.

We support blended flexible working which means that co-owners will respond to you during their working hours and we appreciate that you will respond during your own working hours.

[turley.co.uk](https://www.turley.co.uk)
[Twitter](#)
[LinkedIn](#)

Think of the environment, please do not print unnecessarily
This e-mail is intended for the above named only, is strictly confidential and may also be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient please do not read, print, re-transmit, store or act in reliance on it or any attachments. Instead, please notify the sender and then immediately and permanently delete it. Turley bank account details will not change during the course of an instruction and we will never change our bank account details via email. If you are in any doubt, please do not send funds to us electronically without speaking to a member of our team first to verify our account details. We will not accept liability for any payments into an incorrect bank account. Turley is a trading name of Turley Associates Ltd, registered in England and Wales Registered No 2235387 Registered Office 1 New York Street, Manchester, M1 4HD. Terms and Conditions

From: Jenny Fryer
Sent: 20 April 2021 22:35
To: Robert Griffin
Subject: FW: 188 Wilmslow Road Ref: 129020/FO/2020 - Agreement of viewpoints for TVIA

Evening Rob

I just wanted to drop you a line to apologise for not flagging the below email was going to be coming over to you.

We've been instructed on the TVIA works recently and are hoping to get this actioned within the next couple of weeks to align with the agreed extension of time for determination of the application and to ensure you have sufficient time to review the document. It would therefore be greatly appreciated if you could respond to Isabel's email by the end of the week if possible.

Many thanks in advance.

Kind regards
Jenny

From: Isabel Jones [<mailto:isabel.jones@turley.co.uk>]
Sent: 20 April 2021 12:32

Fw: Planning application reference 129020/FO/2020 - 188 Wilmslow Road

Robert Griffin <robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk>

Thu 20/05/2021 15:09

To: Jenny Fryer <jenny.fryer@turley.co.uk>

Dear Jenny

I hope you are well. Our EHO has reviewed the revised CEMP submitted recently and have made the following comments:

"With regard to the asbestos, the CMP only seems to cover removal of asbestos containing materials in the demolition process. No mention has been made of the asbestos in the soil and what steps will be taken to ensure the site operatives will be protected before the asbestos containing soil is covered. The CMP quotes various pieces of legislation, but no specific measures that will be taken for this stage of the construction process."

Kind regards

Rob Griffin
Principal Planner
Development Management South
Planning, Licensing and Building Control
Growth and Development Directorate
Manchester City Council
PO Box 532
Manchester
M60 2LA

T: 0161 234 4527

e: robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk

From: Jenny Fryer <jenny.fryer@turley.co.uk>

Sent: 29 March 2021 09:15

To: Robert Griffin <robert.griffin@manchester.gov.uk>

Cc: Stephen Bell <stephen.bell@turley.co.uk>

Subject: RE: Planning application reference 129020/FO/2020 - 188 Wilmslow Road

Morning Rob

Further to the below please see attached CMP with updated Saturday working hours and updated Waste Management information in line with the Environmental Health Officer's comments.

I trust these address the comments sufficiently and will be added to the online application documentation.

Many thanks

Kind regards
Jenny

Jenny Fryer
Senior Planner

Turley

1 New York Street
Manchester M1 4HD
T 0161 233 7878
M 07990 887 815
D 0161 233 7875
We are a CarbonNeutral® certified company.

We are working remotely wherever possible in line with Government guidance. Our co-owners are contactable in the usual ways and we suggest using mobile numbers in the first instance.

We support blended flexible working which means that co-owners will respond to you during their working hours and we appreciate that you will respond during your own working hours.

[turley.co.uk](https://www.turley.co.uk)
[Twitter](#)
[LinkedIn](#)

Think of the environment, please do not print unnecessarily
This e-mail is intended for the above named only, is strictly confidential and may also be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient please do not read, print, re-transmit, store or act in reliance on it or any attachments. Instead, please notify the sender and then immediately and permanently delete it. Turley bank account details will not change during the course of an instruction and we will never change our bank account details via email. If you are in any doubt, please do not send funds to us electronically without speaking to a member of our team first to verify our account details. We will not accept liability for any payments into an incorrect bank account. Turley is a trading name of Turley Associates Ltd, registered in England and Wales Registered No 2236387 Registered Office 1 New York Street, Manchester, M1 4HD. Terms and Conditions

From: Jenny Fryer

Sent: 23 March 2021 16:53

To: Robert Griffin

Cc: Stephen Bell

Subject: RE: Planning application reference 129020/FO/2020 - 188 Wilmslow Road

Hi Rob

Thank you for your email.

We're reviewing all of the comments but in relation to the missing information in respect of gas monitoring, please see below an updated Ground Investigation Report. There have been no changes to the report itself or the conclusions but I believe a small number of pages have been added to an appendix as they were incorrectly missed at the time of submission. I trust this can be passed through to the relevant contact so any further comments can be made.

<https://we.tl/t-7O4Bgk7Zph>

Many thanks

Kind regards
Jenny