

Comments for Planning Application 142652/FO/2025

Application Summary

Application Number: 142652/FO/2025

Address: Chorlton Square Shopping Centre Barlow Moor Road Manchester M21 9AQ

Proposal: Erection of 6 no. residential buildings of 10, 8, 6 and 4 storeys in height to provide up to 262 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with ground floor commercial uses (Use Class E (a-e)); infrastructure works including electric substation and associated utilities works, basement and ground level car parking, service yard, vehicular and pedestrian accesses; together with public realm works and hard/soft landscaping following the demolition of the existing buildings and structures on site.

Case Officer: Robert Griffin

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This new proposal is substantively the same as the previous version that I also objected too. However, since then another new development has taken shape, also at the main junction, called Kemp's Corner. If the present developers were to examine this they would see a building that harmonises with those contiguous to it, barely evident as a "new" building at all, in no danger of "spoiling the view" at the junction. The present developers, unfortunately, if they proceed as planned, will be creating an eyesore, one that, with its disproportionate height, will be horribly visible from distance as well as close up. The rationale for such a high tower seems to be that there is a similarly high building already there. Can I ask, when the slums were cleared, were they replaced with newer slums? Of course not. Likewise this tower, built at a time when such were the norm, should not be replaced with another, using its height as a justification, rather than prevailing architectural orthodoxies and general aesthetic appeal. The reasoning is essentially nonsense. The only possible saving grace would be if the accommodation contained within was so reasonably priced as to be affordable for first time buyers on low wages, something that is so unlikely as to be deemed a fanciful suggestion. I object to the proposal in the strongest possible terms.