

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
REPORT FOR RESOLUTION

COMMITTEE PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS

DATE 26 July 2007

SUBJECT **081737/FO/2006/C3**
Mixed use development comprising retail/office use (Use Classes A1,A2,A3 and/or B1), 221 residential apartments, 98 serviced apart-hotel units, gymnasium, ancillary basement car parking, external amenity space and riverside walkway

081738/CC/2006/C3
CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT - Demolition of existing building to allow redevelopment of the site for a mixed use scheme

LOCATION 1 Water Street Water Street Manchester M3 4JU

APPLICANT MCR Contractors Ltd Suite 5 MSV Building Lower Chatham Street Manchester M1 5SU

AGENT Hodder Associates 113-115 Portland Street Manchester M1 6DW

REPORT OF HEAD OF PLANNING

WARDS AFFECTED HULME WARD

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To describe the above application for planning permission, the issues involved and to put forward recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Head of Planning therefore recommends that the Committee be minded to approve planning application **081737/FO/2006/C3** and conservation area consent application **081738/CC/2006/C3** subject to a S106 agreement for a financial contribution towards environmental and infrastructure works within the City Centre, for the reasons set out in this report.

Financial Consequences for the Revenue Budget

There are no financial consequences for the revenue budget.

Financial Consequences for the Capital Budget

There are no financial consequences for the capital budget.

Contact Officer(s)

Lucy Harrison	(0161) 234 4651
David Roscoe	(0161) 234 4567

Background Documents

Planning application 081737/FO/2006/C3
Conservation area consent application 081738/CC/2006/C3
The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (UDP)
A Guide to Development in Manchester
Irwell City Park Draft Planning Guidance
DETR Circular 02/99 Environmental Impact Assessment
DETR Circular 07/99: Departures
Planning Policy Guidance Notes 1, 3, 6, 8, 13, 15, 16 and 24
RPG 13
CABE and English Heritage Guidance on Tall Buildings

Responses of:

Engineering Services
Head Of Valuation & Property Services
Environmental Health
Contaminated Land Section
Director Of Housing
Environment & Operations (Highway Authority)
Environment & Operations (Refuse & Sustainability)
English Heritage (NW Region)
Environment Agency
GMPTE
Greater Manchester Police
Salford City Council
British Waterways Board
Commission For Architecture And The Built Environment

Third Party Consultations:

Cannon Electric Ltd Unit 2 Derwent Street Trading Estate Ordsall Salford M5 4RE
Ducknalls Unit 4 Derwent Street Trading Estate Ordsall Salford M5 4RE
E A P International Ltd Unit 6-8 Manchester Industrial Centre Water Street Central
Manchester M3 4JW
Gabriel Communications Ltd Unit 5 Derwent Street Trading Estate Ordsall Salford
M5 4RE

Grosvenor Casino Riverside Regent Road Ordsall Salford M5 4SX
Harry Ramsdens Water Street Hulme Manchester M3 4JU
Hotel Campanile 55 Ordsall Lane Ordsall Salford M5 4RS
Johnstones Paints Regent Road Ordsall Salford M5 4SX
Kolectaset 183 Water Street Hulme Manchester M3 4JU
Library Theatre Workshops Unit 5 Manchester Industrial Centre Water Street
Central Manchester M3 4JW
New West Unit 3 Derwent Street Trading Estate Ordsall Salford M5 4RE
Porcelanosa Water Street Hulme Manchester M3 4JU
Redrow Homes (nw) Ltd Priory Court Wellfield Road Preston Brook WA7 3FR
Theatre Co Unit 5 New Elm Road Central Manchester M3 4JH
Units 1, 6 & 7 Derwent Street Trading Estate Ordsall Salford M5 4RE
28 Dawson Street Manchester M3 4JZ
Stc Castlefield Dawson Street Manchester M3 4JZ
Unit 2, 2a, 3, 4, 5 & 6 Manchester Industrial Centre New Elm Road Manchester M3
4JU
Manchester Industrial Centre New Elm Road Manchester M3 4JU
185 Water Street Manchester M3 4JU
Flats 1 to 68, 185 Water Street Manchester M3 4JU
187 Water Street Manchester M3 4JD
189 Water Street Manchester M3 4JA
191 Water Street Manchester M3 4JA
Flats 1 to 59, 187 Water Street Manchester M3 4JD
Flats 1 to 42, 189 Water Street Manchester M3 4JA
Flats 1 to 66, 191 Water Street Manchester M3 4JA
5 New Elm Road Manchester M3 4JH
6 New Elm Road Manchester M3 4JH
Harry Ramsdens Water Street Manchester M3 4JU
125 Water Street Manchester M3 4JU
183 Water Street Manchester M3 4JU
123 Water Street Manchester M3 4JU
113 Water Street Manchester M3 4JU
121 Water Street Manchester M3 4JU
127 Water Street Manchester M3 4JU
129 Water Street Manchester M3 4JU
131 Water Street Manchester M3 4JU
122 Water Street Manchester M3 4PU
Units 5, 6 & 8 Manchester Industrial Centre Water Street Manchester M3 4JW
126 Water Street Manchester M3 4JX
Library Theatre Workshops Unit 5 New Elm Road Manchester M3 4JH
Library Theatre Workshops Unit 5 Manchester Industrial Centre Water Street
Manchester M3 4JW
Grosvenor Casino Riverside Regent Road Manchester M5 4SX
Hotel Campanile 55 Ordsall Lane Manchester M5 4RS
Porcelanosa Water Street Manchester M3 4JU
Apartments 1 to 8, 183 Water Street Castlefield Manchester M34 4JU
Roger Leebody (Apt 3b, 183 Water Street) C/o 6 Gorsey Brow Romiley Stockport
SK6 3BQ
304 Timber Wharf 32 Worsley Street Manchester
13 Mellor Drive Worsley Manchester

Apartment 115 Vie 189 Water Street Manchester M3 4JA
 Apartments 67 to 125, 189 Water Street M3 4JA
 Apartments 126 to 167, 187 Water Street M3 4JD
 Apartments 168 to 208, 185 Water Street M3 4JU
 Apartment 141 187 Water Street M3 4JD
 Apt 38 City Gate 1 Blantyre Street Manchester
 Apt 86 Citygate 1 Blantyre St Manchester
 Vie 185 Water Street Manchester M3 4JU
 Apt 57 191 Water Street Manchester M3 4JA
 House Of Commons London SW1A 0AA
 Apartment 32 Vie Apartments 192 Water Street Castlefield
 Apartment 32 Vie 191 Water Street Castlefield Manchester
 48 Hillreach SE18 4AL
 60 City Gate 1 Blantyre Street Castlefield Manchester
 10 Citygate, Blantyre Street, Manchester
 Apt 28 Vie Building, 191 Water Street, Manchester
 84 citygate, 1 blantyre street, manchester
 APARTMENT 100 185 WATER STREET MANCHESTER
 413 The Base, 12 arundel Street Manchester
 Apartment 80 1 CityGate Blantyre Street Manchester M15 4JU
 Apt 25, 191 Water Street, Manchester
 410 Boxworks 4 worseley street
 Vie Apartments Water Street Manchester
 Apt 175 Vie 185 Water Street
 26 Legh Drive Woodley Stockport
 14 Shiel Street Walkden Manchester
 5 woollam place liverpool road castlefield
 202 Former St Georges Church Arundel St Manchester
 Apartment 115, Vie, 189 Water Street, Manchester
 Apartment 35, Vie, 189 Water Street, Manchester
 Apartment 515 Timber Wharf 32 Worsley Street Hulme Manchester M15 4NY
 Block Property Management Atrium House 574 Manchester Road Bury BL9 9SW
 Liverpool Road M3 4JN
 Flat 11 Egerton House 2 Slate Wharf Manchester M15 4SY
 119E Liverpool Road Castlefield Manchester M3 4JN
 Flat 46 Britannia Mills 11 Hulme Hall Road Manchester M15 4LA
 202 Former St Georges Church Arundel Street Manchester M15 4JZ
 Apartment 6 183 Water Street Manchester M3 4JU
 Manchester Civic Society 8 Blantyre Street Castlefield Manchester M15 4LG
 Apartment 310 Box Works Worsley Street Castlefield Manchester M15 4NU

Third Party Representations (081737/FO/2006/C3)

Clare Wilson	185 Water Street Manchester M3 4JU
Paul Sykes-White	Flat 35 191 Water Street Manchester M3 4JA
Neil Gibbs	Apartment 1 183 Water Street Castlefield Manchester M34 4JU
Mike Powell	Apartment 2 183 Water Street Castlefield Manchester M34 4JU
Andrew Rust	Apartment 6 183 Water Street Castlefield

	Manchester M34 4JU
Caroline Devlin And Stephen Devlin	Apartment 7 183 Water Street Castlefield Manchester M34 4JU
Matthew Snarr	Apartment 8 183 Water Street Castlefield Manchester M34 4JU
Roger Leebody	Roger Leebody (Apt 3b, 183 Water Street) C/o 6 Gorse Brow Romiley Stockport SK6 3BQ
Philip Orchard	304 Timber Wharf 32 Worsley Street Manchester
Acremoss Designs Ltd (for Water Street Management Ltd)	13 Mellor Drive Worsley Manchester
Paul Lowth	Apartment 115 Vie 189 Water Street Manchester M3 4JA
Tony Harris	Apartment 57 191 Water Street M3 4JA
Allison Perry	Apartment 177 185 Water Street M3 4JU
Stephen Lake	Apt 38 City Gate 1 Blantyre Street Manchester
Daniel Graham	Apt 86 Citygate 1 Blantyre St Manchester
Junyong Mei	Vie 185 Water Street Manchester M3 4JU
David Parry	Apt 57 191 Water Street Manchester M3 4JA
Tony Lloyd MP	House Of Commons London SW1A 0AA
Ian Mullins	Apartment 32 Vie Apartments 192 Water Street Castlefield
Paul De La Cruz	Apartment 32 Vie 191 Water Street Castlefield Manchester
Jonathan Turner	48 Hillreach SE18 4AL
Dr Erika Harno	60 City Gate 1 Blantyre Street Castlefield Manchester
Faye Greenhalgh	10 Citygate, Blantyre Street, Manchester
William But	Apt 28 Vie Building, 191 Water Street, Manchester
RUSSELL GREENHALGH	84 citygate,1 blantyre street,manchester
JUNYONG MEI	APARTMENT 100 185 WATER STREET MANCHESTER
Annie Geraghty	413 The Base, 12 arundel Street Manchester
Paul Cannon	Apartment 80 1 CityGate Blantyre Street Manchester M15 4JU
Mark O'Hanlon	Apt 25, 191 Water Street, Manchester
Des Fagan	410 Boxworks 4 worseley street
M L Bason	Vie Apartments Water Street Manchester
Tymoteusz Majewski	Apt 175 Vie 185 Water Street
Richard Borrell	26 Legh Drive Woodley Stockport
Angela Simms	14 Shiel Street Walkden Manchester
angela chung	5 woollam place liverpool road castlefield
<u>Anonimised at requested of individual</u>	
Paul Lowth	Apartment 115, Vie, 189 Water Street, Manchester
Paul Sykes-White	Apartment 35, Vie, 189 Water Street, Manchester
Mr Fergus Reid	
Mr James Williams	
Ms Laura Hackett	Apartment 515 Timber Wharf 32 Worsley Street

Mrs Carolyn Taylor	Hulme Manchester M15 4NY Block Property Management Atrium House 574 Manchester Road Bury BL9 9SW
Dr Glyn Redworth	Liverpool Road M3 4JN
Ms Amanda Jones	
Ms Leanne Atkinson	
Mr Paul Hardman	
M Hefford	
Ms Angel Roldan-Ortiz	
Ms Helen Davis	Flat 11 Egerton House 2 Slate Wharf Manchester M15 4SY
Ms Chantelle Culshaw	119E Liverpool Road Castlefield Manchester M3 4JN
Mr Graeme Brown	Flat 46 Britannia Mills 11 Hulme Hall Road Manchester M15 4LA
M Yusuf	
Mr Haydn Roberts	
Mr Ian Cuddy	202 Former St Georges Church Arundel Street Manchester M15 4JZ
Mr Richard Neilson	
Ms Linda Rust	Apartment 6 183 Water Street Manchester M3 4JU
Mr David Astbury	Manchester Civic Society 8 Blantyre Street Castlefield Manchester M15 4LG
Mr Ian Mclean	
Mr John Entwistle	
Mr Joshua Steiner	
Mr Mark Habib	
Ms Norah Burns	
Ms Libby Marshall	
Mr Matthew Robertshaw	
Mr Jonathan Turner	
Mr Phil Livingstone	
Mr Roger Leebody	
Mr Danny Benson	
Mr Mark Whittington	
Mr Paul Goodey	
Ms Wendy Wright	Apartment 310 Box Works Worsley Street Castlefield Manchester M15 4NU
Jose Witter	
Piera Gerrard	
Mr Adrian Byrne	
Mr Matthew Hammond	
Tymoteusz Majewski	
Mr John Mills	
Mr Des Fagan	
Ms Claire Burke	
Mr Steven Lindsay	
Ms Erika Harno	
Ms Jennifer Fagan	
Angela Reid	Worsley Mill, Blantyre Street Manchester

Howard Carr
S L Broadley

Moorfield, Moor Lane, M7
Apt 191, 185 Water Street

Third Party Representations (081738/CC/2006/C3)

Philip Orchard
Craig Hines

304 Timber Wharf 32 Worsley Street Manchester
Loft 206 Box Works Worsley Street
MANCHESTER

Wards affected

Hulme Ward

Implications for:

Anti-poverty	Equal Opportunities	Environment	Employment
No	Yes	Yes	Yes

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The applications were deferred from the 28 June 2007 Planning and Highways Committee to allow Members the opportunity to visit the site.
- 1.2 The applications relate to a site bounded by Regent Road to the north, Water Street to the east, the River Irwell to the west and the Redrow Homes 'Vie' apartments to the south. It is part of a much larger 'island' site that is bounded by the Inner Relief Route and the Rivers Medlock and Irwell and is at a major gateway entrance route into the City Centre from the national motorway network to the west.
- 1.3 Until relatively recently, the area had seen little change and development for many years. The three exceptions to this are the developments of the Harry Ramsdens restaurant, the Porcelanosa retail scheme and the conversion of 183 Water St into apartments. More recently, the former Searchlight site has been redeveloped as apartments and the wider area has seen extensive residential development particularly within the St Georges area of Hulme.
- 1.4 The site is 0.46 ha and is occupied by the two storey 'Harry Ramsdens' restaurant building and a tarmac surface level car park with small scale landscaping. The site is within the Castlefield Conservation Area and lies just outside the tentative World Heritage Site.

2. THE APPLICATION

- 2.1 The proposal is to demolish the existing building to allow the site to be redeveloped for a mixed-use scheme. The proposed layout is roughly L-shaped in plan with blocks fronting Regent Road and Water Street connected by a 'hinged' corner

tower element. The block fronting Regent Road would be fifteen storeys high, and the block fronting Water Street would gradually step up from six storeys at the southern end of the site to 29 storeys in the tower element at the corner of Regent Road and Water Street. The residential tower would be separated from the office serviced apartment block above the first floor by a gap approximately five metres wide, with a narrow glazed bridge link set towards the rear of the Regent Road block at the higher levels to link the serviced apartments to the lift core within the tower.

- 2.2 The proposed building would have retail (A1, A2, and/or A3) floor space on the ground floor fronting Water Street and at the corner of Regent Road. Six floors (including ground) of commercial (B1 offices) space are proposed fronting Regent Road with nine storeys of serviced apartments above. Access to the offices is from pavement level on Regent Road (which is approximately one storey higher than the Water Street pavement level).
- 2.3 The upper floors of the building would be occupied by 221 apartments in the block fronting Water Street and the tower element at the corner of Regent Road, and 98 serviced apartments in the floors above the office space fronting Regent Road. A single storey gymnasium for residents is proposed fronting the river.
- 2.4 A total of 195 car parking spaces would be provided at ground and two basement levels within the building with access off Water Street. The ground floor parking would be located within the development behind the commercial units and gymnasium. A green amenity space would be provided above the car parking overlooking the river.
- 2.5 The tower element of the building at the corner of Regent Road would have a triple height fully glazed space at ground level to accommodate the retail units. It would be visually separated from the other two blocks by vertical glazed slots to the stair cores and the residential corridor. It would consist of vertical glazing to living room areas with other areas being clad in Tecu 'Brass' rainscreen panels with a projecting horizontal seam detail, recessed horizontal glazed windows and a vertical column of glazed balconies.
- 2.6 The first six floors of the block on Regent Road, which form the office element of the building, would be clad in full height curtain wall glazing. The floors above, which would accommodate the serviced apartments, would be clad in the Tecu 'Brass' rainscreen panels with glazing and acoustic louvres.
- 2.7 The ground floor of the block on Water Street would form a double height space with full height glazing on a stone plinth to the retail units. Above this base the building would appear as several vertical elements, defined by cantilevered precast concrete sleeves, containing vertical elements of Tecu 'Brass' rainscreen panels, glazing and glazed balconies.

3. **CONSULTATIONS**

3.1 **Environmental Health** - No objections in principle subject to conditions dealing with fume extraction, hours, acoustic attenuation, servicing hours and refuse storage and disposal are attached to any consent.

3.2 **English Heritage (NW Region)** - EH has no comments to make on the applications and advises that they should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of specialist conservation advice.

3.3 **Commission For Architecture And The Built Environment (CABE)** - CABE consider that there are many aspects of the proposal to be admired. However, they have concerns with the juxtaposition of the residential building with the office/serviced apartment building, which seem to them to sit uncomfortably on the site. They consider that this may be because the massing response to the Vie building, while a rational move in itself, is taking place on too small an element of the wider area. As a consequence they believe the massing feels cramped. They therefore suggest that a rethink of the relative massing of the two buildings and how they relate to each other would be helpful. They suspect that the office/serviced apartment building fronting Regent Road may simply be too big.

3.4 **Environment Agency** - No objections in principle.

3.5 **GMPTE** - No objections

3.6 **Greater Manchester Police** - No objections

3.7 **Salford City Council** – Wishes to object to the application as they have significant concerns regarding the overall design quality of the proposal. Whilst they believe a greater degree of enclosure and the use of height and some scale is more appropriate for this location than the existing situation, they believe the scale and massing of the proposed building would result in a massive form that would dominate the immediate surroundings with a large bulk that would impose on the skyline and views from around the area. A slender tower at the junction of Regent Road and Water Street could be considered appropriate.

It is not clear if the proposal realizes the full potential of the river and provides the river with vitality and safety. The proposal should complement and support the Irwell City Park Scheme.

The site is located adjacent to Salford's Air Quality Management Area and they raise concerns that the proposal may adversely affect air quality within the district. They have given a standard condition requiring an air quality assessment to be submitted for information.

3.8 **British Waterways Board** - The site does not lie within the BW consultation zone therefore BW have no comments to make.

3.9 **Head of Engineering Services** – No objections have been received.

- 3.10 **Manchester Historic Buildings and Conservation Areas Panel** – “The Panel did not object to the demolition of the existing building as it was not felt to make a positive contribution to the conservation area.

The Panel was disappointed that the submission did not include a model. In the Panel’s opinion it is important that a scheme of this magnitude and scale be explained fully in 3 dimensions, and this is most easily done by an accurate model.

The Panel could find nothing good to say about the proposed building in this setting, considering it to be of an excessive height and bulk without demonstrating sufficient logic or reason in terms of urban design for such a structure in this location at the junction of Water Street and the river.

The Panel considered the proposed building, even if reduced in height, does not properly address the river or follow any of the cues set by the adjacent newly completed development.

The Panel noted the weak design of the tower, especially at its base, where it appears that 24 storeys of building mass are sitting only on a glass prism.

The Panel noted that the site has great potential, but that the proposal does not deliver an appropriate solution for this part of the Castlefield conservation area. A much better design solution is needed promoting a better dispersal of building blocks, elements and masses.

The Panel considered the proposal to be an inappropriate overdevelopment of the site, doing nothing to address the street, viaduct and river. It would serve only to dwarf and overpower the very features which make the conservation area special.

The Panel felt strongly that the proposed development would have a negative impact on the character of the Castlefield conservation area.

Recommend – Refuse.”

- 3.11 **Greater Manchester Ecology Unit** – The application site does not have significant ecological interest, therefore GMEU have no objections, but recommend protection of the River Irwell during construction and no clearance of the site until it has been shown that there are no nesting birds.

- 3.12 **Head of Engineering Services** – No objections in principle subject to the gates being set back to enable all entering vehicles to wait on private land for the gates to open. Vehicle manoeuvres in themselves would not interfere with those for nearby developments, but the approved parking layout for the development opposite at 183 Water Street should be enforced to prevent reversing onto the highway. Proposed footway gradients, pedestrian visibility splays at the access and minor kerb/footway works are required.

4. **PUBLICITY**

- 4.1 The planning application has been advertised as:
- a major development;
 - affecting the character or appearance of the Castlefield Conservation Area; and
 - being subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment;
- 4.2 Site notices have been displayed and nearby neighbours have been notified.
- 4.3 The conservation area consent application has been advertised and site notices displayed.
- 4.4 34 responses have been received from neighbours objecting to the scheme on the following grounds:
- Size and scale of the development - the proposal would be overdominant and would bear no relationship to the scale, height or streetscape of Water Street;
 - Poor design - the repetitive format of the pod-like units is functional but not iconic and the roof top maintenance platforms would have a questionable visual impact;
 - It would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the Castlefield Conservation Area and tentative World Heritage Site;
 - The existing highway and junction would not cope with the increased traffic generation. The vehicular entrance would be adjacent to those of the Vie development and 183 Water Street all of which are or will be controlled entry systems causing problems with queuing vehicles. The number of car parking spaces is inadequate leading to local parking problems;
 - Lack of permeability and impenetrable façade to Water Street;
 - Lack of social engagement with surrounding developments and no 'sense of place';
 - Lack of contribution to public space and facilities, apart from riverside walkway;
 - Little attempt has been made to invest in emerging technologies or to demonstrate how the target of 10% of power from renewable sources is to be achieved;
 - The assessments undertaken conclude that there will be a detrimental effect on the amenity enjoyed by local residents in terms of over shadowing, daylight reduction, tv reception and the micro-climate;
 - No consideration has been made for the wind velocities that would be created
 - The scale of the visual assessment photograph in View 1 is reduced in the proposed image giving a reduction in perceived impact.
 - No visual representation indicating the effect that the proposal would have on the existing building of 183 Water Street has been submitted;
 - Inadequate separation distance between the windows of 183 Water Street and the proposed building;
 - Concern regarding the initial points of reference of the Daylight/Overshadowing Survey in that this has assumed a baseline daylight level typical to the City Centre rather than using the actual daylight levels that exist there now;
 - Details of the pre-application public consultation procedures that were undertaken are needed;

- The applicant did not consult the residents of the adjacent Vie development at pre-application stage and all issues raised by the residents of 183 Water Street were ignored.
- Site notices have not been displayed on site.
- A detailed tree report and justification for the removal of trees from the site together with detailed landscape proposals are needed.
- Details of public art should be submitted.
- A housing needs assessment should be produced.
- The provision of Copper walling panels does not reflect the present urban environment, and is a concern in terms of sustainability;
- Noise, dust and general disruption from construction over a long period of time.
- Noise and disruption from so many extra people living so closely together and from clients of the apart-hotel.
- Serviced apartments will attract people with no sense of community leading to increase in crime, noise and litter.
- Loss of privacy due to close proximity of buildings.
- Negative impact on marine life due to the building overshadowing the River Irwell.
- Site should become an open park area with river taxis – the building would destroy any continuation of this in the area;
- City Centre properties will be devalued as housing supply outstrips demand;
- Increase in crime;
- More rats;
- Already lack of local amenities for present population;
- This proposal should be considered in the light of the Crosby Homes development near the viaduct as they will have a massive potential effect on the area and are in danger of ‘strangling’ the conservation area.
- Lack of family housing will result in the City Centre being only a place for people to live in the first few years of their working lives.

4.5 A letter has been received from Councillor Marc Ramsbottom objecting to the planning application on the following grounds: inadequate consultation with local residents (no residents in City Centre ward were consulted); overdevelopment of the site; tall buildings with this number of apartments should be located in a sustainable location, closer to the City Centre and clustered with other tall buildings so as not to adversely affect the skyline; the absence of a tall buildings policy in Manchester is resulting in applications from various locations forming no coherence and that will have a negative visual impact on the skyline; adverse effect on the character of the Conservation Area and the settings of historic buildings and structures in the area such as the Castlefield viaduct; additional traffic problems on Water Street and its junction with Regent Road; traffic problems associated with the vehicular entrance being situated so close to the existing vehicular entrances of Vie and 183 Water Street – entrance should be sited further up Water Street.

4.6 Letters have been received from Tony Lloyd MP attaching four of his constituents letters and asking that their points are taken into consideration. These letters and their content are included in the summary above.

- 4.7 MP Tony Lloyd has forwarded a copy of a letter from one of his constituents the content of which has already been reported within the committee report.
- 4.8 MP Tony Lloyd has made a written representation on behalf of local residents making the following comments:
- There is a real question now about the size and density of development that the City is prepared to allow in the central part of the City and whether to have no policy or an extremely loose one in respect of this is desirable.
 - He draws attention to the Panel's "scathing assessment" of the scheme and the over development of this area.
 - There needs to be caution in considering whether the number of apartments being built are necessary as Revenue and Benefits figures show 14.1% of residences within the City Centre ward are empty.
 - It is important to consider other adjoining sites such as the Porcelanosa site as any decision on Harry Ramsdens would be used as a template for that site and other sites in the vicinity.
 - Proper consideration needs to be given to the adequacy of local facilities within the Castlefield and St Georges area and whether such facilities have kept pace with development.
 - He is very concerned about the impact the development would have on traffic, in particular the access/egress in Water Street and the amount of traffic on the Mancunian Way/Regent Road, which is already highly congested.
- 4.9 Manchester Civic Society object to the proposal on the grounds that they believe the scale and massing of the proposal is totally inappropriate for this important gateway scheme within the Castlefield Conservation Area.

5. ISSUES

5.1 National Policy

5.1.1 Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1): Creating Sustainable Communities

PPS1 encourages the promotion of urban and rural regeneration to improve the well-being of communities, improve facilities, promote high quality and safe development and create new opportunities for the people living in those communities. Policies should promote mixed use developments that create linkages between different uses and create more vibrant places. The principle of the development proposed is clearly in accordance with PPS1.

5.1.2 Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 (PPG 3): Housing

This guidance strongly encourages the re-use of previously developed vacant or under-utilised land or buildings and lends support to new housing within urban areas at high densities that are in close proximity to existing services and facilities and public transport provision. The proposal accords with this guidance as the proposed development would be built on vacant brownfield land with good public transport links.

5.1.3 Regional Spatial Strategy (RPG13)

There are relevant policies in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RPG13) related to this proposal. These are as follows:

- 5.1.3.1 DP1 - This policy advises that new development and other investment in infrastructure and services should be located so as to make the most effective use of land, promote appropriate mixes of uses within a site and its wider neighbourhood, make efficient use of transport facilities and assist people in to meet their needs locally.
- 5.1.3.2 DP3 - This policy states that new development must demonstrate good design quality and respect for its setting.
- 5.1.3.3 SD1 - This is a general policy which advises that new development and redevelopment of good quality should be encouraged which will provide a significant proportion of the new and better housing and other development required to cope with anticipated household growth in the Region. It must be coupled with economic growth through urban regeneration, re-use of previously developed land, and creative improvements to the public realm in order to create a more dynamic, attractive and competitive Metropolitan Area. The application site falls within the North West Metropolitan Area (NWMA) as identified in this policy. Moreover, the site is within the first priority part of the NMWA that includes the City Centre and surrounding inner areas falling within the administrative areas of Manchester and Salford Councils. This proposal therefore supports a key regeneration area within the region. It is considered that this scheme generally complies with this policy.
- 5.1.3.4 UR1 - This policy advises that local authorities and other regional agencies should work together to provide an accessible, desirable, living and working conditions that ensure a good quality of life for all. Urban renaissance should be promoted, amongst other criteria, by reviving communities, reviving local economies including industrial restructuring, and tackling low demand for housing and poor physical conditions. The re-use of derelict land and buildings, the balanced distribution of good quality dwellings, access to open space, will improve the appeal of urban areas, contribute to their regeneration and safeguard their future. It is considered that this proposal complies with this policy and will provide good quality housing and improve physical surroundings in the area.
- 5.1.3.5 UR4 - This policy advises that the redevelopment and re-use of vacant sites and buildings within urban areas should be a priority. Additional development should be encouraged to make best use of such sites in sustainable locations. In Manchester the target within the policy is that 90% of new housing will be on previously developed land. This application includes the erection of 11 new houses on previously developed land and therefore it is considered that the proposal generally complies with this policy.
- 5.1.3.6 Draft Regional Spatial Strategy (January 2006) - Policy DP1 continues the approach set out in policies DP1 and DP3 of the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy. The proposal is in accordance with the principles set out in policy DP1. Furthermore, the proposed development is consistent with policy RDF1 which sets out the main development locations across the region including the Manchester City Region. MCR1 and MCR2 are the key sub-regional policies that relate to the site. The proposals are generally in accordance with the policy framework set out in these policies.

5.2 **Unitary Development Plan (UDP)**

- 5.2.1 The application is considered to be consistent with UDP Policies and in particular with policies H1.2 (Housing – Housing Provision), H2.2 (Housing - Residential Development), H2.7 (Housing - Design of Housing), I1.6 (Employment & Economic Development - Office Development), I3.1 (Employment & Economic Development - Design of Commercial Development) E1.1 (Environmental Improvement & Protection - Air Pollution), E1.4 (Environmental Improvement & Protection - Noise Control), E1.5 (Environmental Improvement & Protection - Energy Conservation), E3.4 (Environmental Improvement & Protection - River Walkways), E3.5 (Environmental Improvement & Protection - Safe Environments), R1.1 (Regeneration) S1.1 (Shopping - City Centre Environment), T3.7 (Transport – Cycle Parking), L1.9 (Leisure & Recreation - Cafes), L1.3 (Leisure & Recreation - Access to Waterways), RC3 (Mixed Uses), RC4 (Environment), RC5 (Waterways), RC6 (Tourism), RC7 (Gateway Sites), RC9 (Offices), RC10 (Shopping), RC11 (Housing), RC17 (Car Parking), RC18 (Pedestrians), DC7.1 (New Housing Development), DC9.1 (New Commercial & Industrial Development - Access for Disabled People), DC10.1 (Food & Drink), DC10.2 (Food & Drink).
- 5.2.2 Furthermore, it is considered that the scheme would maintain the appearance, character and setting of the Castlefield Conservation Area in accordance with policies E3.8 (Environmental Improvement & Protection – Conservation Areas) and DC18.1 (Conservation Areas). The proposal is also consistent with the Small Area Framework for this area (policy RC20 - Area 27) building on significant recent developments in the area.

5.3 **Irwell City Park Draft Planning Guidance**

- 5.3.1 Irwell City Park (ICP) is a joint initiative between Salford and Manchester City Councils and Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council to realise the potential of the River Irwell throughout the regional centre as an urbanised natural asset and distinctive landscape feature within the urban environment. The vision for ICP centres on the development of premium quality open spaces, linked together by a walkable river frontage, which relates to current and future developments along the city centre reach of the corridor and uses of the river itself. Draft Planning Guidance for ICP has been drawn up and approval is sought from the Executive on 25 July 2007 for undertaking public consultation on the Guidance. The Guidance builds on existing policies within the Unitary Development Plan, which aim to create a sense of place, improve accessibility, promote environmental sustainability and ensure a mix of active frontages.
- 5.3.2 The proposed scheme at Water Street would provide a five metre wide river walkway to link with the walkway adjacent to the Vie development. An active frontage is provided for a large part of the frontage by the provision of a gym with access off the walkway and windows overlooking the walkway. A roof top garden would overlook the river at first floor level. A condition requiring the car park wall adjacent to the walkway to be designed to create interest at the walkway level should be attached to any permission. Given the above it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with the ICP Draft Planning Guidance.

5.4 **Environmental Impact Assessment**

5.4.1 The applicant has submitted an Environmental Statement in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 and Circular 2/99 ('The Regulations'). During the EIA process the applicant has considered an extensive range of potential environmental effects and it is considered that the issues that could give rise to significant impact are:

- Socio-economic impact (regeneration, creation of new housing and improved pedestrian access along the River Irwell);
- Townscape and impact on the Castlefield Conservation Area;
- Visual impact (at construction phase and occupation/operational phase) on a particular viewpoint with the Castlefield Conservation Area and on 183 Water Street and the Vie development;
- Historic environment in terms of the impact on the setting of the Castlefield Conservation Area;
- Transport issues;
- TV and radio reception;

5.4.2 It is considered that the environmental statement has provided the Local Planning Authority with sufficient information to understand the likely environmental effects of the proposals and any required mitigation.

5.5 **The Scheme's contribution to regeneration**

5.5.1 Regeneration is an important planning consideration and is recognised as such by the UDP. Over the past ten years the City Council has had a considerable amount of success in terms of regenerating the City Centre. The work in the City Centre Renewal Area, Piccadilly, Spinningfields, the G-Mex area, Northern Quarter and Castlefield are all good examples of this. However, much remains to be done if the City Centre is to remain competitive and it will be important to ensure that investment in Manchester continues. There is still work to do in Castlefield, especially in terms of how this area is integrated into the remainder of the City Centre. In many ways, the area is still perceived as being remote from the rest of the City Centre and this is reinforced by the 'barrier' formed by the railway viaduct and the Inner Relief Route. The scale, quality and quantum of development proposed would help to address this issue of connectivity. The proposal would help to increase the residential population and bring additional vitality to the area, increasing access to the riverside. The proposal is a truly mixed use scheme bringing activity throughout the day and into the evening and, with no more than 33 per cent of apartments being one bedroom encouraging a wider mix of occupiers and a more stable population. The apart-hotel would be managed through a staffed reception area providing a managed use that responds to an increasing demand for such uses within the City Centre and contributing to the City Centre as a business and tourist centre. Therefore this scheme would contribute positively to the regeneration of the area and the City Centre.

5.6 **CABE/ English Heritage Guidance on Tall Buildings**

5.6.1 One of the main issues to consider in assessing this proposal is whether this is an appropriate site for buildings of the size proposed. In order to assess this, the proposals have been thoroughly assessed against UDP Policies, PPG 15 (paragraphs 5.2 and 5.7) and the following criteria as set out in the Guidance on Tall Buildings Document published by English Heritage and CABE:

5.6.2 **“Relationship to context” and “The effect on the whole existing environment”**

5.6.2.1 Under these criteria the effect of the proposal on key views, listed buildings, conservation areas, the tentative World Heritage Site, archaeology and open spaces has been considered. In relation to this a visual assessment has been undertaken, which considered the building within its immediate context and within the cityscape from various approaches into the City Centre. Seven views, considered to be most significant, were selected for analysis, using photomontage images of the proposals. The historic aspects are dealt with below under ‘Impact on the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings’ (para 5.7).

5.6.2.2 The building would have a high impact on many of the views approaching the City Centre, particularly the view down Regent Road, but the visual assessment concludes that the visual effect would be moderate and the impact is not significant as view of the building would generally be framed by the surrounding built environment and viewed in context with other structures of a similar scale reducing its dominance. Regent Road is a major gateway route into the City Centre where mixed use developments with high standards of architectural treatment are required. The building is a high quality design and would use high quality materials and the high impact that the building would have when viewed along this route is considered appropriate as it is a gateway site.

5.6.2.3 One viewpoint of the building that is considered to have a significant impact would be from within the Castlefield Conservation Area just south of the Events Arena and adjacent to the railway viaduct looking along the River Medlock. From this viewpoint the majority of the proposed development would be visible against the skyline through the natural open corridor created by the line of the River Medlock. The building would appear as a relatively prominent, permanent new element in the middle ground although its perceived scale would be reduced by the dominance of the adjacent viaduct supports. Whilst the impact would be significant the effect of this would not necessarily be adverse, depending on individual opinion on the architectural style of the building.

5.6.2.4 The visual assessment also considers that the proposal would have a significant visual impact on the residents at 183 Water Street and residents in the Vie development as the building would form a new permanent and dominant element in existing views. This impact could be beneficial or adverse depending on the individual opinion on the design and style of the building. It is important therefore that the architecture and materials used on the building are of the highest quality.

5.6.2.5 Whilst the building would result in a prominent tall building within the immediate vicinity, it is considered that it would create a major landmark on this area, providing an architectural statement of high quality and focus, thus enhancing the City's skyline and having an overall positive effect on the townscape.

5.6.3 **“Relationship to Public Transport Infrastructure”**

5.6.3.1 Under this section the benefits of the site's location in terms of achieving a sustainable transport strategy, the capacity of the existing transport infrastructure and the quality of linkages to public transport have been considered. The site is in a good location benefiting from access to the public transport infrastructure of the City Centre and proximity to the City Centre services and attractions. The site is ideally located for cyclists with a cycle path running in front of the site and cycle parking facilities being included within the development. The proposal would provide 195 car park spaces, and the applicant has put forward a Travel Plan to support the development, with one of the measures being to join the City Centre Car Club to ensure adequate facilities are in place to deal with any demand for parking or car use. Given these measures and the site's proximity to public transport connections and City Centre facilities it is considered that this is adequate.

5.6.3.2 A transport assessment has been submitted in support of the application. This assessment concludes that the increase in traffic generated by the development would result in driver delay on Trinity Way approach to the Water Street/Regent Road junction but that this is deemed acceptable as it is a combination of the location of the junction on a congested section of the strategic City Centre highway network and the delay is in part due to the signal staging and phasing. The junction is at its optimal layout and no physical improvements are therefore required. Mitigation measures for reducing this impact include the travel plan mentioned above to encourage use of sustainable transport and to take advantage of the site's good proximity to public transport. The transport assessment predicts a large percentage increase in traffic flow on the short section of Water Street on which the development would be located, but considers this to be numerically insignificant as the percentage increase would be due to this section of Water Street being a cul-de-sac with low traffic flows. The assessment considers that the predicted two-way development flows would add little more than one additional vehicle per minute on Water Street in the peak hours and concludes therefore that the likely traffic impact of the development would not be significant.

5.6.3.3 It is considered therefore that the site is in an optimum location for sustainable transport links and the proposals would have no significant detrimental net impact on the highway network.

5.6.4 **“Architectural Quality”**

5.6.4.1 The factors that are of most importance in this respect are the building's scale, form, massing, proportion and silhouette, facing materials and relationship to other structures. The proposal is for a tall building that would be significantly larger than those surrounding the site and the impact of this has been discussed elsewhere in the report (paragraph 5.5.3). It is important that the architectural quality of the

scheme is very high and it is considered in this instance to be the case. The building can be split into three main elements: the tower, the block fronting Regent Road; and the block fronting Water Street, all of which respond to their individual context/streetscape. The cascading design of the Water Street elevation would break down the mass of the building as it moves away from Regent Road, creating an appropriate relationship with the urban context of Regent Road and the street scale of the existing adjacent buildings. In long distance views from Castlefield this cascading effect would be appreciated giving the building a slender elegant aspect and reducing the impact of the silhouette of the building on the skyline. The comments of CABE, regarding the relationship of the block on Regent Road to the tower element of the building, are being considered by the architect with a view to reducing the Regent Road block in line with their comments. Any changes will be reported to committee. The materials used would largely comprise glazing and Tecu 'Brass' cladding and a condition requiring samples of materials should be attached to ensure their quality. It is considered therefore, that the proposals are of the highest quality and would result in a sophisticated, elegant landmark building.

5.6.5 "Contribution to Public Spaces and Facilities"

It is important to ensure that the development interacts positively with and contributes to its surroundings at street level. The site is located within a triangular area of Castlefield that is effectively an 'island' due to it being bounded by the Inner Relief Route, the River Irwell, the River Medlock and the railway viaduct. This area is currently occupied mainly by residential apartments, with the only other use in the area being the tile and bathroom showroom on the opposite side of Water Street and the vacant restaurant building on the application site. The ground floor level of the proposed building would incorporate public facilities including offices, shops, financial and professional services and restaurants and cafés, creating activity along Water Street and Regent Road and to this part of Castlefield as a whole, ensuring the area is populated during the day and evening and increasing natural surveillance and reducing the potential for crime. The proposal includes the widening and improvement of the riverside walkway to link it up with the walkway provided adjacent to the Vie development. This and the increased level of activity on the site would greatly increase the potential for the public to use and appreciate the river. The gym would be situated adjacent to and overlooking the riverside walkway, providing animation to the walkway and improving its natural surveillance. It is considered therefore that the proposal would make a positive contribution to public spaces and facilities within the immediate area.

5.6.6 "Effects on Local Environment"

5.6.6.1 This is a critical issue, as amongst other things, this examines the impact the scheme would have on nearby and adjoining residents. It includes the consideration of issues such as impact on microclimate, overshadowing, night-time appearance, vehicle movements and the environment and amenity of those in the vicinity of the building.

5.6.6.2 Sunlight, Daylight, Shading, Solar Dazzle, Privacy and Overlooking

An assessment has been carried out to consider the potential impacts of the proposals in terms of daylight, sunlight and shading on existing neighbouring properties. The assessment was undertaken in relation to the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines based on the British Standard 8206 Part 2.

5.6.6.3 Sunlight and shadowing

The sunlight assessment concludes that the main impact of the building on sunlight would be to the east, north and west of the application site where none of the properties are residential or have a specific requirement for sunlight. It is considered therefore that the development would not have a detrimental impact on the levels of sunlight to nearby properties and would not detrimentally overshadow surrounding properties.

5.6.6.4 Daylight

The daylight assessment that has been carried out is based on guidelines set out in the Building Research Establishment (BRE) report 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight – A guide to good practice' by P J Littlefair. The assessment acknowledges that the Harry Ramsden building is a low building surrounded by a car park and the nearby buildings are therefore enjoying unusually high levels of daylight. Therefore, in developing the site to a greater level, many windows within nearby buildings would inevitably fail to meet the strict interpretation of some of the guidelines. The assessment therefore takes the approach of considering whether the daylight levels after development would be reasonable for the location. This is considered to be a reasonable approach to take as the BRE report states "The advice given here is not mandatory... Although it gives numerical guidelines these should be interpreted flexibly.... For example in an historic city center a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable...". There are three different ways of measuring diffuse daylight. The assessment has considered all three measures, but attaches most weight to the Average Daylight Factor (ADF) as this is a measure of the daylight within a room and accounts for factors such as the number of windows and their size in relation to the size of the room. The main residential building that would be affected in terms of levels of daylight would be 183 Water Street. The assessment found that just one bedroom on the second floor would technically not meet the ADF guidelines after development but only by a modest amount. However, if this window is examined under one of the other measures set out in the BRE report it exceeds the guidelines and the assessment therefore concludes that the daylight reaching the window would be adequate after development and the reason the ADF figure is lower is due to the size of the window in relation to the size of the room. The assessment concludes that some obstruction of daylight to this building would be unavoidable, but any obstruction would be kept to a minimum and the internal daylight enjoyed by the residents of 183 Water Street after development would exceed the BRE guidelines.

5.6.6.5 Solar Dazzle

Solar dazzle can occur when sunlight is reflected from a glazed façade. It is considered that the element of glazing within the facades is not at a level so as to cause problems of solar dazzle as most of the facades would consist of 'solid' material with glazing accommodated within that, rather than fully glazed facades at high levels.

5.6.6.6 Privacy and Overlooking

Existing buildings facing the proposed building would be the bathroom and tile showroom and the residential building 183 Water Street. Diagonally across the Regent Road junction with Water Street are some low industrial units set behind a landscaped area. It is considered that there would not be any detrimental impact in terms of privacy or overlooking on these industrial units or on the bath and tile showroom. To the south of the site is the new Vie apartment building, which has no windows that would directly face the proposed building and it is considered that there would be no detrimental impact on that building in terms of privacy and overlooking. The main building that would be affected by the proposed building would be 183 Water Street, which has windows that would directly face the new apartment building. The window to window separation distance would be approximately 13 metres, and, whilst this will clearly have a major impact on occupiers of 183 Water Street compared to the current situation, it is considered that this is not an unreasonable separation distance within a city centre location.

5.6.6.7 Noise

The acoustic report submitted with the application, concludes that with appropriate acoustic design of the proposed buildings, reasonable internal noise levels can be achieved. The impact of noise from the proposed uses can be controlled through acoustic insulation measures and appropriate conditions to address the comments of the Head of Environmental Health should be attached to any consent. Measures to mitigate potential significant effects during the construction period have been included within the Environmental Statement.

5.6.6.8 Wind

A wind tunnel study has been carried out to determine what the wind conditions around the proposed development would be. The assessment concludes that the overall impact would be acceptable. Pedestrian walking would remain tolerable/acceptable in all locations tested. Along Regent Road some areas would be unacceptable for long-term sitting and this can be mitigated by not providing seating in these areas. Along the river conditions would be generally acceptable/tolerable for pedestrian walking and long term sitting with just one point on the riverside being unacceptable for long-term sitting. It is considered that this can be addressed through planting and bench location. It is considered therefore that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the wind environment around the site and suitable mitigation measures such as planting and bench location have been recommended which will ensure that there are no unacceptable impacts produced by the wind at street level.

5.6.6.9 TV reception

A TV and radio reception study has been undertaken that identifies potential shadowing and reflection of signals and suggests a range of possible remedies for viewers located in the area affected. Any consent should be conditioned to require further detailed surveys during construction if necessary and after construction and to undertake appropriate measures to mitigate against any effects.

5.6.6.10 Given the above discussion it is considered that, with appropriate mitigation measures the impact on the local environment would be acceptable.

5.6.7 “Contribution to Permeability and Linkages”

5.6.7.1 The contribution of the proposals to permeability, linkages on foot and, where appropriate, the opening up, or closure, of views to improve the legibility (ie the degree to which a place can be easily understood and traversed) of the city and the wider townscape is an important planning consideration. The proposal would upgrade the quality of the routes around the site and would improve the route down to the river and along the river. The location of the gym and the landscaped roof garden would overlook the riverside walkway improving the natural surveillance of the area. The routes around the site on Water Street and Regent Road would be enhanced by the active nature of the uses that would adjoin them. It would enhance important views and vistas by the development of a site that currently has a negative impact on the area and would assist orientation within the City Centre. It is considered therefore that the proposals would contribute positively to permeability, linkages and the legibility of the City Centre and wider townscape.

5.6.8 “Function and Fitness for Purpose”

5.6.8.1 The proposals would create high quality internal and external public space and would make a significant contribution towards improving the public realm. As the proposal would provide a high quality, useable environment for those using it, it is considered that the proposals would meet the criteria of function and fitness for purpose.

5.6.9 “Sustainability”

5.6.9.1 The environmental statement accompanying the application provides an assessment of the sustainability of the proposal in terms of the physical, social and economic impact. These are considered throughout this report. It is considered that the proposals would be highly sustainable in terms of the above impacts. The proposal is expected to receive an Eco-Homes rating of at least ‘very good’.

5.6.10 In assessing the above criteria it is considered that the applicant has thoroughly demonstrated that the proposals would satisfactorily meet the English Heritage and CABE guidance and that the proposals would provide a tall building of a quality acceptable to this site.

5.7 Impact On The Conservation Area and Listed Buildings

5.7.1 The City Council has a statutory duty when considering proposals in a conservation area to ensure that the character or appearance of the area is preserved or enhanced. Consent is required for the demolition of any building in a conservation area and PPG15 gives guidance that decisions to demolish buildings in a conservation area should be assessed against the same criteria that are used for listed buildings. Where the existing building makes little or no contribution to the conservation area, members will need to have full information about what is proposed after demolition. Consent for demolition should not be given unless there are acceptable and detailed plans for redevelopment. Therefore, the main issue to consider is the contribution that the building makes to the character and

appearance of the Castlefield Conservation Area and whether the proposal for demolition and redevelopment would maintain or enhance the character and appearance of the area. The building was constructed in the early 1990s and is a two-storey brick building with a shallow-pitched slate roof. It has a glazed entrance on Water Street and covered walkway to the principle facades on Water Street and Regent Road. The building has no historic or architectural interest and contributes little to the conservation area. There is, therefore, no objection to the demolition of the existing building, providing the proposed redevelopment maintains or enhances the character and appearance of conservation area.

- 5.7.2 The character of this part of Castlefield Conservation Area is defined by the canal and river network, over-layered by substantial railway viaducts. The conservation area is characterised by substantial buildings many of which have a direct relationship with the waterways and with some standing in open areas. Others take the back of pavement position that is typical of Manchester City Centre buildings. The proposal is in a part of the conservation area that is landlocked from the rest of the Conservation Area and the rest of the City Centre by the Inner Relief Route, the River Irwell and the River Medlock and the railway viaduct. In this particular part of the Conservation Area there are a number of new developments, such as the Vie building, which is up to 12 storeys in height, and the St George's Island buildings, which are 15 storeys in height. An older building close to the site is the three storey early 20th century commercial building of 183 Water Street, now converted to apartments.
- 5.7.3 It should be acknowledged that the physical character and amount of development has changed the area in recent years through the driving force of regeneration initiatives by both the public and private sectors. This investment has produced an attractive environment, made it easier for the public to walk through it, and has introduced a positive mix of uses, none of which was possible in the area's historic heyday when it served only as an area linking canal, road and rail networks to service the industrialisation of Manchester. This is an important point as the character of the area, whilst having important historic references is not a recreation of those earlier industrial times.
- 5.7.4 The proposal would use high quality materials, and would have a deeply modelled elevation and a varied skyline, creating a lively and contemporary design, which is to be welcomed in Castlefield. The building would step down to recognise the existing buildings adjacent to it and rises up to its tallest point at the corner of Water Street and Regent Road, defining this focal point. The use of non-traditional materials is considered to be acceptable providing they are high quality and a condition requiring samples of the materials to be approved should be attached to any consent. Views of the building in the visual assessment provided show that it would be seen in some but not all views from Castlefield Canal basin. It is considered that its peripheral location on the edge of Castlefield, adjacent to the River Irwell is acceptable and would reduce the impact of the building on the rest of the Conservation Area, reflecting other tall buildings that are viewed on the periphery of the Conservation Area, such as the Hilton Hotel.

5.7.5 Given the above, it is considered that this proposal is an appropriate form of development within the Castlefield Conservation Area and would enhance the character and appearance of the area.

5.7.6 There are no listed buildings or structures within the immediate vicinity of the site and it is considered that the proposal would not have an impact on the settings of any listed buildings.

5.8 **Microclimate**

5.8.1 In considering the impact of the proposals on microclimate wind, shadow and daylight studies have been carried out. These areas have been discussed under the “Effect on Local Environment” section in paragraph 5.4.7 above.

5.9 **Amenity**

5.9.1 Issues of amenity, such as overshadowing, overlooking and noise have been discussed above within the “Effect on Local Environment” section (paragraph 5.4.7). It is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupiers of nearby buildings and would form an acceptable development for occupiers of the proposed building itself. In addition, the applicant has undertaken to submit a management strategy and mitigation measures for the construction phase of the development in order to minimise disruption, noise, dust and vibration from the construction works on the local environment.

5.10 **Crime and disorder**

5.10.1 The density and mix of uses will bring significantly more activity into the area, allowing adjacent streets and riverside areas to be overlooked, contributing towards a safe and secure environment. The ground floor areas of the buildings would contain offices, retail, café and restaurant uses, maximising the active frontage to existing streets and encouraging passive surveillance.

5.10.2 Greater Manchester Police have been involved in significant pre-application discussions and have provided a Crime Impact Assessment that looks in detail at potential crime and disorder issues, which could affect the proposed development and neighbouring area. The applicant has addressed the concerns raised within the Statement and Greater Manchester Police are satisfied that the proposal would not increase anti social behaviour. A condition requiring the proposal to achieve Secured By Design accreditation should be attached.

5.11 **Socio-Economic Impact**

5.11.1 The Environmental Statement has made an assessment of the socio-economic impact of the proposal, in particular considering the effects of the proposed redevelopment on the local employment base, local businesses and housing provision. It also considers the wider effects of the scheme upon social and community infrastructure within Manchester.

- 5.11.2 The assessment predicts that the development would lead to the creation of a minimum of 282 permanent jobs, through a combination of direct and indirect employment, together with other employment from sustaining local economic activity. The proposed development could potentially attract major investors because of its City Centre location and the office floorspace would encourage other businesses to set up within the site. The creation of jobs and the regeneration benefits of the proposal are to be welcomed in revitalising a run-down and underused area.
- 5.11.3 The proposal would provide 245 residential apartments and 128 C1 apart-hotel units, which would make a significant contribution to the demand for temporary and permanent accommodation. It would provide housing and accommodation in a place that is highly accessible, with improved pedestrian and transport links. In addition, the new housing would contribute to the creation of a potentially strong and vibrant community, which would be part of a working neighbourhood with new and existing job opportunities immediately to hand.
- 5.11.4 It is considered therefore that the proposals would bring extensive socio-economic benefits to the City Centre and the wider area of Greater Manchester, and would help increase activity at this end of the City Centre, building on the investment and regeneration that has already taken place.

5.12 **Parking/Servicing/Access**

The impact of the proposal on parking and the highway network has been considered under the “Relationship to Public Transport Infrastructure” section under paragraph 5.4.4 above. It is considered that adequate parking and servicing would be provided within the scheme.

5.13 **Access**

There would be access for all into and throughout the building and the riverside walkway. A minimum of 5 per cent of car parking spaces would be suitable for use by disabled persons.

5.14 **Response to CABE comments**

- 5.14.1 The proposal has been amended in response to the comments from CABE so that the mass of the serviced apartments/office building has been reduced by omitting two floors and that block and the residential tower have been separated by the omission of a structural bay, significantly reducing the mass of the block and allowing the two blocks to read as separate buildings. The serviced apartments/office building has also been visually split along the central spine corridor to further reduce the perceived bulk/massing of the building. The vertical concrete fins to the serviced apartments have been extended down over the office component in order to unite the block into a more elegant composition. Two floors at sixth and seventh floor level on Water Street have also been removed to further enhance the elegance of the tower on the corner and to reduce the visual bulk of the scheme on Water Street. The scheme has been amended so that there are now no windowless bedrooms. It is considered that the amendments adequately address CABE’s comments and further improve the design of the proposal.

5.15 **Response to objections**

5.15.1 Most of the material issues raised by objectors have been fully considered above. However, other points raised are dealt with below:

- Lack of permeability and an impenetrable façade on Water Street – whilst the site is fairly open at the moment with a large part of it taken up by a surface car park it is inevitable that the proposed building would appear to be less penetrable. However, the building would follow the back of pavement on Water Street, which is characteristic of City Centre buildings and would provide active ground floor uses providing activity and interest in the streetscene. The building would provide improved access to the riverside through the provision of a riverside walkway;
- Whilst the scale of the visual assessment photograph in View 1 does appear to be reduced, it is considered that adequate information, including other viewpoints, drawings and a model have been submitted to properly consider the proposal;
- It is considered that the impact of the proposal on the property of 183 Water Street can be properly assessed from the information submitted with the application, as discussed in the point above;
- The agent has supplied the local planning authority (lpa) with details of the pre-application public consultation exercise that was carried out. It is not a statutory requirement for this to be carried out or for details of it to be submitted with the application;
- The agent has informed the local planning authority that the Vie building was largely unoccupied at the time of the pre-application consultation. The architect states that points raised by the residents of 183 Water Street were taken into account through the reduction in height of the proposed building opposite 183. The residents also wished to see the building handed so that the courtyard faced Water Street, but the architects were keen from an urban design aspect to reinforce the street edge and to minimise overshadowing of the river. Other points raised, such as traffic congestion and disruption during construction are dealt with in the Environmental Statement.
- It is not considered necessary for a detailed tree report to be submitted with the application as it is considered that there are no trees of great merit on the site and the benefits of the comprehensive redevelopment of the site are considered to outway any loss of trees. A landscape plan has been submitted with the application and a condition requiring a detailed landscape scheme should be attached to any permission;
- It is not considered necessary to include public art as part of the scheme;
- A housing needs assessment is not considered necessary;
- As discussed in the sections above the materials proposed are considered to be acceptable and the overall sustainability of the proposal is considered to be acceptable;
- The applicant has submitted details of measures to reduce any problems from construction and any problems that might arise would be dealt with under Environmental Health legislation;
- The serviced apartments would be just one part of a mixed use scheme, with a much larger part being residential apartments, increasing the level of

community that already exists in the area. The serviced apartments and their entrance would front Regent Road and would be subject to a management regime, so it is considered unlikely that any problems of noise or litter would affect residents on Water Street.

- The GMEU have not raised concerns about the building overshadowing the River Irwell and thereby having a negative effect on marine wildlife.
- The site is a development site and not considered appropriate to be kept as an open park area. It would still be possible for river taxis to operate in the future.
- The impact on property values in the area is difficult to predict and is not a material planning consideration. However, it is considered that this development would significantly improve the current environment and appearance of this particular part of Castlefield, which currently has a rundown appearance, building on the regeneration that has already taken place in other parts of Castlefield.
- It is considered that the development of the site with a high quality building would not result in more rats;
- It is considered that this proposal and the proposal by Crosby Homes on Potato Wharf are high quality developments that would enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area;
- The proposal proposes a maximum of 33 per cent of one bedroom apartments in line with City Council aspirations to allow people within the City Centre to move up the 'property ladder'.

5.15.2 Response to Historic Buildings and Conservation Areas Panel comments

It is considered that the Panel's comments have been dealt with within the Issues section of the committee report. To summarise, the application submission does include a model but unfortunately this was not available on the day the Panel met, the height and scale of the building is considered appropriate on this gateway site, the building addresses the river by providing a 5 metre wide river walkway and by locating the courtyard element (rather than the largest bulk) of the building adjacent to the river; it also relates acceptably to the adjacent Vie development, following that building line and reducing in height to respect that of the Vie development; the tower element of the scheme has a double height glazed unit at ground floor, which defines this level of the building and is typical of buildings within the City Centre. This space is defined by a horizontal concrete fin above which the rest of the building sits and it is considered that the overall design of this element of the building has a bold vertical emphasis which is entirely appropriate; it is considered that the proposal responds well to the character of the conservation area and respects the lines of the river, road and viaduct.

5.15.3 Response to MP Tony Lloyd letter

- The City Council does have a tall buildings policy that consists of the Guide to Development in Manchester, the CABE/English Heritage guidance on tall buildings, existing policy constraints within the City Centre due to existing listed buildings and conservation areas plus any relevant site specific factors that would be considered on their own merits. The proposal has been considered against all these elements and is considered to be acceptable.
- The Panel comments are dealt with above.

- It is not considered necessary at the present time to restrict the amount of housing within the City Centre and regional guidance directs new investment in housing development to this area.
- Granting permission for the proposed development on this site would not provide a template for other sites adjacent or in the vicinity as each site is considered on its own merits and proposals such as this have to provide a thorough assessment through an environmental statement that they are appropriate for their particular site.
- It is acknowledged that facilities to support the growing residential population within the City Centre are required and the City Council therefore encourages mixed use developments such as this, which provide floorspace for non-residential uses that could be used in future for facilities to support the residential population should the demand arise and subject to the usual planning process.
- The impact of the proposal on traffic has been considered within the committee report and the Head of Engineering Services does not have an objection in principle to the development. It is considered therefore that the proposal would be acceptable in highway and traffic terms providing the points raised by the Head of Engineering Services are dealt with before development commences.

5.15.4 Response to Salford City Council

- 5.15.4.1 As discussed within the Committee report and the written late reps it is considered that the development is of a high quality design, using high quality materials and is of a height and scale appropriate to this gateway site. Salford's comments are based on the original scheme, which has since been amended to provide a more elegant slim tower at the corner of Regent Road and Water Street and a less bulky block on Regent Road.
- 5.15.4.2 As discussed above it is considered that the scheme would contribute positively to the Irwell City Park Scheme.
- 5.15.4.3 An air quality assessment has been submitted with the Environmental Statement for the application, which concludes that within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) the use of energy efficient design will ensure that CO2 emissions are low and the incremental change in road traffic flows is not predicted to result in a significant change to pollutant concentrations or affect the achievement of the Air Quality Objectives in 2010.

6.0 **HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1998 CONSIDERATIONS**

- 6.1 This application needs to be considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Under Article 6, the applicants (and those third parties, including local residents, who have made representations) have the right to a fair hearing and to this end the Committee must give full consideration to their comments.
- 6.2 Article 8 and Protocol 1 Article 1 confer(s) a right of respect for a person's home, other land and business assets. In taking account of all material considerations, including Council policy as set out in the Unitary Development Plan, the Head of Planning has concluded that some rights conferred by these Articles on the applicant(s)/objectors/residents and other occupiers and owners of nearby land that might be affected may be interfered with but that that interference is in accordance with the law and justified by being in the public interest and on the basis of the planning merits of the development proposal. He believes that any

restriction on these rights posed by approval of the application is proportionate to the wider benefits of approval and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 There can be no doubt that this is a development site and therefore, the key issue for consideration is the appropriateness or otherwise of the submitted scheme.
- 7.2 In urban design terms, the scheme incorporates and responds to the majority of the key criterion in that it proposes development at back of pavement line to Water Street and Regent Road, and creates a strong and fully accessible walkway along the River Irwell.
- 7.3 The uses that are proposed, namely apartments, an apart-hotel and active uses are all acceptable and appropriate in this area.
- 7.4 It must be acknowledged that any development on this site would have an impact on existing residents and businesses. Residents in particular have benefited from having largely uninterrupted views across the site for a number of years but it is inevitable that at some point development would take place here which would impact upon this and it must be accepted that one does not purchase the view with the property. There is an agreed industry standard to assess the impact of a scheme on amenity in terms of the overall loss of light. The applicant has demonstrated that this scheme has exceeded all of the relevant standards.
- 7.5 The scheme is uncompromisingly modern and this approach of introducing a modern building into a historic environment has worked successfully elsewhere in Manchester and around the country. The URBIS development is a good indication of how modern buildings can sit in close proximity to listed buildings. The impact of the scheme is set out fully in this report and it is considered that whilst the scheme is large, the effects of this are mitigated by the form of the development.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION:**

The Council has taken the environmental information (as defined in the Environmental Impact Assessment regulations) into consideration and the proposal is in accordance with the UDP policies identified in section 5.2 of the report. The Head of Planning therefore recommends that the Committee be **MINDED TO APPROVE** planning application **081737/FO/2006/C3** and conservation area consent application **081738/CC/2006/C3** on the basis that the proposal accords with the development plan, in particular policies H1.2, H2.2, H2.7, I1.6, I3.1, E1.1, E1.4, E1.5, E3.4, E3.5, E3.8, R1.1, S1.1, T3.7, L1.9, RC3, RC4, RC5, RC6, RC7, RC9, RC10, RC11, RC17, RC18, DC7.1, DC9.1, DC10.1, DC10.2, DC18.1 and policy RC20 - Area 27 of the City Council's Unitary Development Plan and policies DP1, DP3, SD1, UR1 and UR4, of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RPG13), policies DP1, MCR1, MCR2 and RDF1 of the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy, guidance contained in PPS1, PPG3 & PPG15 and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise, and subject to:

A A S106 agreement for a financial contribution towards environmental and infrastructure works within the City Centre; and

B The following conditions:

081737/FO/2006/C3

1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason - Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2) Before the development commences, full details that address all outstanding highway matters shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - In the interests of highway safety, pursuant to the City of Manchester Unitary Development Plan Policy RC12 and RC17.

3) Before any use hereby approved commences, the premises shall be acoustically insulated and treated to limit the break out of noise in accordance with a noise study of the premises and a scheme of acoustic treatment that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of the building and occupiers of nearby properties, pursuant to policy H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

4) Before the development commences an acoustic attenuation scheme including particulars of the acoustic glazing and acoustically treated ventilation to be installed as part of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full before use of the residential premises first commences.

Reason - To protect the amenity of the occupants of the premises once the development hereby approved is occupied, pursuant to policy H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

5) Before first occupation of the development the building, together with any externally mounted ancillary equipment, shall be acoustically insulated in accordance with a scheme 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 equipment.

Reason - To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential accommodation, pursuant to policy H2.2 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan.

6) Before development commences a scheme for the extraction of any fumes, vapours and odours from the premises hereby approved shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the City Council as local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to occupancy and shall remain operational thereafter.

Reason - In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers nearby properties in order to comply with Policy H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

7) No loading or unloading shall be carried out on the site outside the hours of 0730 and 2000 Monday to Saturday and 1000 and 1800 on Sundays/Bank Holidays.

Reason - In order to protect the amenity of local residents and in accordance with Policy H2.2 in accordance with the Unitary Development plan for the City of Manchester.

8) No part of the building marked **** on plan **** shall be occupied until the opening hours of such part have been agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. That part of the building shall thereafter not open outside the approved hours,

Reason - In order that the local planning authority can achieve the objectives both of protecting the amenity of local residents and ensuring a variety of uses at street level in the redeveloped area in accordance with Policies H2.2 and DC 26 in accordance with the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

9) No development shall commence until the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority:

- (a) A desk based archaeological assessment of the site;
- (b) A scheme for digging archaeological trial trenches on site (including timetables and particulars of the persons supervising the digging);
- (c) A scheme for investigating, evaluating and archiving any finds and for publishing details thereof (including timetables and particulars of the persons who will carry out said tasks).

The schemes approved under (b) and (c) above shall be implemented in accordance with the timetables contained therein and no development shall take place on site until written confirmation of completion of the said schemes has been received by the City Council, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - To investigate the archaeological interest of the site and record and preserve any remains of archaeological interest, pursuant to Policy DC20.1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and guidance in PPG16.

10) No development shall commence until a scheme for the storage (including segregated waste recycling) 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.

Reason - In the interests of amenity and public health, pursuant to policy H2.2 of the adopted UDP.

11) No part of the development shall be occupied until space and facilities for bicycle parking have been provided in accordance with the approved drawings. The approved space and facilities shall then be retained and permanently reserved for bicycle parking.

Reason - To ensure that adequate provision is made for bicycle parking so that persons occupying or visiting the development have a range of options in relation to mode of transport in order to comply with Policies T3.1, T3.6 and T3.7 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

12) Before the development hereby approved commences a report to assess the likely extent of any ground contamination and/or ground gas being present on or affecting the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. Any necessary site investigations shall then be carried out according to a scheme to be agreed in advance with the City Council as local planning authority and implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason - To ensure that the presence of or the potential for any contaminated land/ground gas is detected and appropriate remedial action is taken in the interests of public safety, pursuant to Manchester Unitary Development Plan policies H2.1, H2.2, E3.1 and E3.2.

13) The development hereby approved shall include a building lighting scheme and a scheme for the illumination of all external areas during the period between dusk and dawn, or as may be otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. Full details of such a scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority before the development commences. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full before the development is first occupied unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - In the interests of amenity, crime reduction and the personal safety of those using the proposed development, pursuant to Manchester Unitary Development Plan policies H2.2, E3.3 and E3.5.

14) A landscaping scheme for all external areas of the site, incorporating all hard landscaping proposals shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development. The approved scheme shall be implemented not later than 12 months from the date the buildings are first occupied. Any trees or shrubs removed, dying or becoming severely damaged or becoming severely diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced by trees or shrubs of a similar size or species to those

originally required to be planted unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - To ensure that a satisfactory landscaping scheme for the development is carried out, and to mitigate the effects of wind at ground level pursuant to Manchester Unitary Development Plan policies H2.1, H2.7, E2.6 E3.5 and H2.2.

15) The development hereby approved shall not commence unless and until a Construction Management Plan for the protection of the River Irwell has been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - In the interests of the protection of the River Irwell pursuant to Manchester Unitary Development Plan policies T4.1, H2.2, E2.6 and E3.5.

16) Construction of the works hereby approved by this permission shall not take place until samples and specifications of the materials to be used on all external elevations (including the roof) of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. In discharge of this condition, elevations showing the distribution of natural stone shall also be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The development shall be constructed only using the approved materials and elevations unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable to the City Council as local planning authority in the interests of the visual amenity of the area within which the site is located, pursuant to policy H2.2 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan.

17) The applicant shall, with regard to television reception in the area containing the application site, provide the City Council as local planning authority with studies that:

a) Measure the existing television signal reception within the potential impact area, as identified in the Taylor Bros Installations (Bolton) Ltd report dated 23 & 24 November 2006, and within an area of 500 metres radius surrounding the building, before development commences. The work shall be undertaken either by an aerial installer registered with the Confederation of Aerial Industries or by a body approved by the Independent Television Commission, and shall include an assessment of the survey results obtained.

b) Assess the impact of the development on television signal reception within the potential impact area identified in (a) above within one month of the practical completion of the development or before the development is first occupied, whichever is the sooner, and at any other time during the construction of the development if requested in writing by the City Council as local planning authority in response to identified television signal reception problems within the potential impact area. The study shall identify such measures necessary to maintain at least the pre-existing level and quality of signal reception identified in the survey carried out in (a) above. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as Local

Planning Authority, the measures identified must be carried out either before the building is first occupied or within one month of the study being submitted to the City Council as local planning authority, whichever is the earlier.

Reason - To provide an indication of the area of television signal reception likely to be affected by the development to provide a basis on which to assess the extent to which the development during construction and once built, will affect television reception and to ensure that the development at least maintains the existing level and quality of television signal reception, as advised in Planning Policy Guidance Note 8: Telecommunications, pursuant to Manchester Unitary Development Plan policy H2.2.

18) All vehicles entering and leaving the site during the construction period are to pass through a wheel wash. Details of the wheel wash shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority prior to the development commencing.

Reason

To ensure that the proposed development does not cause unacceptable amounts of dust in the vicinity and to ensure that local roads are kept clear of mud pursuant to policy H2.2 of the adopted Manchester Unitary Development Plan

19) The development hereby approved shall incorporate measures to minimise the risk of crime and to meet the specific security needs of the application site and the development. Any security measures to be implemented in compliance with this condition shall seek to achieve the 'Secured by Design' accreditation awarded by the Greater Manchester Police. Written confirmation of those measures are to be provided to the City Council, as the local planning authority.

Reason - In pursuance of the Council's duty under section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to consider crime and disorder implications in exercising its planning functions; to promote the well-being of the area in pursuance of the Council's powers under section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000, and to reflect the guidance contained in PPS1 "Delivering Sustainable Development", pursuant to Manchester Unitary Development Plan policy E3.5 and E2.7.

20) The commercial element of the development hereby approved shall incorporate measures to minimise the environmental impact and energy use of the building and shall seek to achieve a Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Methodology (BREEAM) rating of at least 'very good'. Written confirmation of this rating is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority before the development is occupied, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason - In the interests of minimising the impact on the environment of the building, pursuant to adopted Manchester Unitary Development Plan policy E1.6, Regional Spatial Strategy policy ER13 and Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1).

21) The residential development hereby approved shall incorporate measures to minimise the environmental impact and energy use of the building and shall seek to achieve the Department for Communities and Local Government's 'Code for Sustainable Homes' rating of '3 Stars'. Written confirmation of this rating is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority before the development is occupied, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason - In the interests of minimising the impact on the environment of the building, pursuant to adopted City of Manchester Unitary Development Plan policy E1.6, Regional Spatial Strategy policy ER13 and Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1).

22) The footpaths and the areas between the pavement and the line of the proposed buildings shall be fully repaved in accordance with details to be agreed in writing by the local planning authority within six months of any part of the development first being occupied, or within a timescale to be agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - In the interests of amenity and to ensure that paving materials are consistent with the use of these areas as pedestrian routes and the site's location within Castlefield Conservation Area, pursuant to City of Manchester Unitary Development Plan Policies E3.6, E3.8 and DC18.

23) The consent hereby granted is for a development that has full access into and throughout all areas of the building for members of the public, including those whose mobility is impaired.

Reason - For the avoidance of doubt and so as to provide direct access for disabled members of the public and to be in line with guidance in UDP Policy DC9.1 'New Commercial and Industrial Development - Access for Disabled People' of the adopted Manchester Unitary Development Plan

24) The car parking indicated on the approved plans, including the fully accessible spaces, shall be demarcated and made available for use prior to the building hereby approved being occupied. The car parking shall then be available and accessible at all times whilst the development hereby approved is occupied.

Reason - To ensure that there is adequate parking for the development proposed when the building is occupied pursuant to policy H2.2 and DC9.1. of the adopted Manchester Unitary Development Plan

25) This permission hereby approved relates to :-

- Use Classes A1, A2 and A3 within the development up to a combined maximum floorspace of 946m² (gross external floorspace);
- Use Class B1 within the development up to a maximum floorspace of 3692 m² (gross external floorspace);
- A gymnasium under Use Class D2 and for no other purpose under Use Class D2 up to a maximum floorspace of 370 m² (gross external floorspace);

- 245 residential units under Use Class C3;
- 128 serviced apartments under Use Class C1;

unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority. No residential unit shall be used for any purpose other than C3.

Reason - For the avoidance of doubt as changes to any element of the development may have consequences in terms of national and local policy considerations, and pursuant to policy H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

26) The development must be begun not later than three months from demolition of the existing building.

Reason - In the interests of visual amenity and for the avoidance of doubt, and to ensure that redevelopment of the site takes place following demolition of the existing building in order to comply with policy DC18.1 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

27) Before first occupation of the serviced apartments a management and letting strategy for those apartments shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - In the interests of the residential amenity of other occupiers of the development and of nearby properties pursuant to policy H2.2 of the City of Manchester Unitary Development Plan.

28) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the drawings numbered A(90)02 A, A(90)003 D, A(20)000 D, A(20)-000 D, A(20)-001 C, A(20)-002 C, A(20)001 D, A(20)002 A, A(20)003 A, A(20)006 A, A(20)008 A, A(20)009 A, A(20)010 A, A(20)011 A, A(20)012 B, A(20)014 A, A(20)015 A, A(20)016 A, A(20)018 A, A(20)019 A, A(20)020 A, A(20)023 A, A(20)024 A, A(20)025 A, A(20)026 A, A(20)027 A, A(20)028 A, A(20)029 A, A(20)100, A(20)101, A(20)103 A, A(20)104, A(20)105, A(20)106, A(20)107, A(20)108, A(20)109, A(20)110, A(20)111, A(20)112, A(20)113, A(20)114, A(20)115, A(20)116, A(20)117, A(20)118, A(20)119, A(20)300 A, A(20)301 A, A(20)302 A, A(20)303 A, A(20)304 A, A(20)305 A, A(20)310 A, A(20)311 A, A(20)500 B, A(20)501, A(20)502 A, A(9)000 A, A(9)001 A unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to policy H2.2 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan.

081738/CC/2006/C3

1) The works to which this consent relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this consent.

Reason - Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as applied and modified in relation to buildings in conservation areas.

2) The development must be begun not later than three months from demolition of the existing building.

Reason - In the interests of visual amenity and for the avoidance of doubt, and to ensure that redevelopment of the site takes place following demolition of the existing building in order to comply with policy DC18.1 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

The documents referred to in the course of this report are either contained in the file(s) relating to application refs: 081737/FO/2006/C3 and 081738/CC/2006/C3 held by Planning or are City Council planning policies, the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, national planning guidance documents, or relevant decisions on other applications or appeals, copies of which are all held by the Planning Division.

Equal Opportunities

The proposal will make the site and its development directly accessible to all members of the public, including those with mobility impairments.

Environmental Improvements

The proposal will bring a significant improvement to the appearance of this site and the area generally.

Employment Implications

The proposal will create jobs during construction and on occupation a number of jobs will be created.

HEAD OF PLANNING