

Application Number	Date of Appln	Committee Date	Ward
089880/V0/2009/C2	21st Apr 2009	28th May 2009	City Centre Ward

Proposal CITY COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT Erection of safety fence comprising stainless steel support with glass infill panel and stainless steel top rail adjacent to full length of wall to canal

Location Towpath Adjacent To Rochdale Canal, Canal Street Between Minshall Street And Princess Street., Manchester, M1 3HE,

Applicant Mr Stephen Dixon , Manchester City Council, Highways Services, Hooper Street, Ardwick, M12 6LA

Agent None

Description

The application relates to the cobbled footpath adjacent to the northern bank of the section of the Rochdale Canal wall which runs from the top end of Canal Street at its junction with Minshull Street, down to its junction with Princess Street. The wall forms the parapet of a brick built canal-retaining wall. The height of the wall from ground level varies from between 1.07m at its highest and 0.41m at its lowest and is broken at its junction with Sackville Street and with Chorlton Street. The canal wall is Grade II listed and the street and the canal lie within the Whitworth Street Conservation Area. This length of Canal Street functions as the canal's tow path and is some 2 to 3 meters above the canal channel and its locks and lock-side landing stages. There are no formal access points to any of these landing stages from Canal Street. Access is available to a towpath on the southern bank from bridges across Minshull Street and Princess Street.

Consent is sought for the erection of a safety fence adjacent to the canal wall. The fence would comprise a series of stainless steel supports with angled glass infill panels and a stainless steel top rail above wall level. The supports would be set within the cobbled setts to the footway within steel support struts. The rail height will be set at a minimum height of 1.1 meters from the ground and a maximum of 1.3 meters to allow a level and consistent rail line throughout the length of the canal wall irrespective of the wall height and ground level variations. The average distance between the front edge of the post and wall will be 220mm. The fence design incorporates a secure access gate (located adjacent to Lock 86) for use by British Waterways staff and has been designed to allow access for occasional hand or horse drawn towline haulage of canal boats towing over the canal wall / safety fence rail and allow unhindered use of emergency throw lines for water rescue.

The scheme has its origins in a coordinated City Council, British Waterways and Cityco (the City Centre's management company) response to a drowning in the canal in March 2008. At the time, this incident was the latest in a number of serious injuries and fatalities resulting from falls over the wall along Canal Street.

The proposals for the barrier scheme originated from a request made by the City Coroner following the Inquest into the fatality in March 2008. The Coroner

wrote to the City Council and British Waterways, as respectively the authority with responsibility for the maintenance of Canal Street, and the canal owner and operator, under Rule 43 of the Coroner's Rules 1984 saying: "I strongly urge for there to be a review of the waterways in the centre of Manchester with the intention of deciding what appropriate extra warning signage, lighting, life saving equipment, etc. may be appropriate in any given area. Consideration might need to be given to additional fencing or walling".

The broad principles used by the City Council, British Waterways and Cityco to select the response to the Coroner's recommendations were shaped by the following considerations:

- i. a joint risk assessment - the Canal Street Water Safety Risk Assessment - undertaken by British Waterways and the City Council in consultation with Greater Manchester Police and Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service. This identified that the hazard on Canal Street was the potential to fall from height over or off the wall either into the canal or onto one of the hard surface landing areas adjacent to the lock chambers. The period of greatest risk is at night-time during and after licensing hours, particularly when visitors are unsupervised. Alcohol is regarded as a contributing factor;
- ii. the potential impact of any solution on the ability of the Emergency Services and/or others to effect the rescue of a member of the public who had fallen into the canal;
- iii. the location of Canal Street and the canal in a conservation area;
- iv. the potential impact on the operation of the canal;
- v. the impact on the maintenance of Canal Street and the ease of maintenance of any new structure; and
- vi. the cost of implementing the scheme and the potential cost of any ongoing maintenance obligation.

The joint risk assessment recommended the installation of a fixed barrier fence to prevent accidental falls over the canal wall. The risk assessment also made other recommendations in terms of signage, lighting and other matters (which, where necessary, will be the subject of separate planning applications) and was agreed by a water safety working party chaired by Cityco and whose membership also included the City Council (including representatives from the Planning Department, Highways Division, Manchester Contracts, Public Protection Team, Public Realm Team, Corporate Health and Safety, Community Safety Team and the City Centre Regeneration Team), British Waterways, Greater Manchester Police and Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service. Additional consultation has been undertaken with the City Council's Building Control Section, the Council's Landscape Practice Group and the Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit.

Following the consultations the following design principles for the erection of a physical barrier were agreed to aid the selection of a preferred option:

- i. the height of the barrier should be at least 1.1 meters from ground level as this is the minimum recommended height for a barrier intended to prevent people falling from height;
- ii. the barrier needed to be designed in such a way that it would prevent people leaning over and sitting on the wall or the safety rail itself, to

- reduce the risk of falling or being pushed backwards into the canal or landing stages;
- iii. the barrier had to act as a deterrent to climbing onto or over the wall, i.e. it must be designed in such a way as to not have footholds;
 - iv. the barrier had to be sufficiently robust to withstand the loadings expected for crowd barriers;
 - v. the barrier had to be a light-weight and visually low impact structure to minimize its impact on the listed wall and on the wider setting;
 - vi. the barrier had to have a minimal impact on the operation of the canal and on canal users;
 - vii. the barrier had to be relatively easy to maintain and had to have a minimal impact on the cleansing and maintenance of canal street;
 - viii. the barrier should have an absolute minimum impact on the ability of the Emergency Services and/or bar staff and or others to facilitate a rescue from the canal channel.

In response to these principles, two broad options were considered:

- i. a fixed barrier either attached to the wall or fixed into the ground immediately adjacent to the wall or
- ii. temporary removable barriers which would be under the control of premises managers along Canal Street that would be put in place along the side of the wall during premises opening hours.

Of the two, the fixed barrier was the preferred option as this was not dependent on the day-to-day management of premises managers and would not be exposed to the risk of removal. A barrier fixed to the wall was also eliminated at an early stage as:

- i. without a full structural survey to assess the integrity of the wall, it was not clear whether or not the upper wall would be able to withstand the leverage loads created by crowds leaning against a barrier;
- ii. it was not clear whether the wall would withstand core drilling to insert and anchor post and rail fencing.

The initial design proposal produced prior to the joint risk assessment being carried out, was a steel post and rail fence standing a short distance from the wall to delineate a safe area. Following discussions with the Council's Corporate Health and Safety Officer and the Planning Service the design proposals were amended to include tensioned wire infill in the gap between the top rail and wall with the top rail and infill canting away from Canal Street over the canal wall to physically prevent people from sitting on the wall. The design was further amended to stainless steel stanchion posts (clear or colour coated) to avoid or reduce the risk of rust precipitation. Consultant engineer, Rourkes, developed the proposal further by recommending either reinforced glass infill or ornate / metal bar infill, giving three infill options in total: tensioned wires, reinforced glass panels, or metal bars.

In relation to the design principles outlined above, it was determined that:

- i. a heavy set metal bar or ornamental metalwork fence would detract from the prominence of the wall and the wider aspect of the canal as environmental features;
- ii. tensioned wire and metalwork could potentially attract the attachment of tokens, memorabilia and memorials given the social aspect of the area, existing memorials to those who have died on Canal Street, and the close proximity of the AIDS memorial on the opposite bank of the canal, requiring public relations and cleansing maintenance costs;
- iii. glass infill panels could potentially attract fly posting, stickers, ink or paint graffiti, etching, or be subject to significant weathering, generating cleansing maintenance costs and potentially operational maintenance costs;
- iv. tensioned wire will require periodic re-tensioning and replacement, generating operational maintenance costs;
- v. all options use 316G stainless steel frame with the exception of the root/ground fixing and the posts are generally on 2 meter centres, the systems designed to comply with the requirements of BS 7818 Parapet Class 3;
- vi. all glass panels would be a minimum 16mm twin wall toughened laminate.

Based on the above the fence being proposed in this application is the preferred option.

The option appraisal that resulted in the choice of this option identified that:

- i. given the maximum and minimum height levels of the wall, and the need to prevent members of the public sitting on the wall and using the safety rail to steady themselves while doing so (i.e. by trying to sit on the wall with their legs tucked under the top rail), it is clear that any barrier at a minimum height of 1.1 meters will need some form of infill between the height of the top of the wall and the top of the barrier fence;
- ii. the type of infill is important as the choice will determine the safety rail's impact on the wall and the wider setting. So, for example, horizontal rails will cause greater visual impact / obstruction than toughened glass panels;
- iii. if the height of the barrier was too high it could impact adversely on the ability of the Emergency Services (or others) to rescue a member of the public from the canal and also on boaters towing their boats by hand or by horse;
- iv. the selection of material and design for the top of the barrier is important as emergency rescue lines and boat tow ropes should not 'snag' on the top of the barrier or encounter substantial frictional resistance. The inclusion of an uninterrupted top rail minimises the potential for snagging, abrasion and resistance;
- v. a top rail will help to protect the infill used beneath it;
- vi. if the barrier is too high, regardless of what it was constructed from, it will create an intrusive barrier between Canal Street and the canal and cause disconnection between the street and canal. It could also impact on the popularity of the area by upsetting the very essence of what it is that makes Canal Street a popular destination.

Consultations

Publicity - The application was advertised as affecting a conservation area, affecting the setting of a listed building and as a public interest development and occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties were notified about the scheme. 48 letters of objection have been received.

The basis of the objections can be broadly divided into four categories: the impact on canal users and user safety; impact on visual amenity, the setting of a listed structure and the character of the conservation area; Management / Maintenance issues; and the Cost / appropriateness of this solution. The objections are thus summarised below:

The impact on canal users and user safety

- Canal Street is one of the very few sites where historically the road functions as the towpath of the canal. This makes the site a special interest area from a historic point of view, but also means that access to the canal from the road must be preserved to a level that allows boating to occur, including boat manhandling and the operation of towed craft.
- That the development will make towing of boats with a horse difficult or impossible.
- That the line between the horse and any boat would be abraded as a result of the fence.
- That the fence will prevent access to set the locks by climbing over the wall and down stone blocks to the lockside. The railings will make it impossible to set the lock ahead so will waste both water and time as boaters' only access will be by boat. This will be likely cause a bottleneck which will waste further water and time as the locks will be out of sequence.
- Impact on statutory right of navigation.
- That the fence would restrict access to the safe working of the lock below the wall.
- That the supporting information submitted with the application is incorrect as access is required for Lock 86 which is currently accessed by stone steps. This is the only way for boaters to rejoin the towpath unless being picked up by boat.
- That access points at each lock balance beam and at Minshall Street bridge will be blocked by the fence.
- That the ability to operate the locks and gain access to boats is already insufficient and sometimes hazardous and that these proposals will be a significant additional hindrance to navigation and will increase risk to boaters attempting to pass along this stretch of canal.
- That the resulting increase in danger will be greater than the mitigation of the hazard that the fence is intended to achieve.
- That the fence will inhibit access for the emergency services in the event of an accident on the waterway and there are concerns that the ease of access for emergency services will be reduced in terms of getting to people who have got into trouble on the boats as a result of the fence.

- It will be more difficult for people to access the canal to attempt a rescue as currently people can in theory lower themselves down the wall and enter the water slowly and carefully rather than having to mount the fence and jump in.

Impact on the setting of a listed structure and the character of the conservation area

- The fence would ruin the proposed fence will have an adverse impact on the setting of the Canal;
- Would ruin the look and feel of the street scene;
- Would compromise the integrity of the conservation area;
- That the fence would ruin another piece of our heritage due to the demands of Health and Safety regulations.

Management / Maintenance issues

- That the glass panels are almost certain to be vandalised, this could include graffiti, the application of stickers and / or posters and the breaking of glass. The latter could put canal users at risk of injury to themselves and damage to their boats;
- The design of the fence would still allow people to easily throw litter through the fence.

Cost / appropriateness of this solution

- That the proposal is an over-reaction;
- That people should take responsibility for their own safety and that the dangers could be alleviated by appropriate lighting and availability of safety equipment;
- The proposal will create a barrier which will discourage interaction between canal users and people using Canal Street;
- That there are many more dangerous places in the City where the money might be more appropriately spent and that the money being spent is disproportionate to the risk;

Manchester Conservation Areas and Historic Buildings Panel – The proposal has been presented to the Panel. Although their formal minutes are not available at the time of writing the main points that were raised by the Panel were that they were not supportive of the principle of the fence and one which would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the listed wall and conservation area. However if some way of preventing people accidentally falling into the Canal has to be implemented other options should be considered, including :

- A simple railing attached to the wall;
- A serrated edge to the existing wall;
- A fence which is stepped to reflect the changes in the wall level;
- The use of a safety net or tension wires on the canal side of the wall.

The Panels formal comments will be reported to Committee.

Greater Manchester Police (Design for Security) - Have no objections subject to the glazed panels having a suitable resistant coating against graffiti and there being a maintenance strategy in place to ensure that any markings are removed promptly.

City Centre Regeneration Team - No comments received.

British Waterways - Have formally stated that they have no objections to the proposals. In other correspondence they describe how they have worked closely with the City Council, emergency services and others to find a solution that is acceptable to all. They have also provided responses to some of the objections raised that specifically relate to the impact of the proposals on canal users and user safety and these are discussed within the issues section of this report below.

Rochdale Canal Society - No comments received.

Village Business Association - No comments received.

Greater Manchester Fire Authority - Have stated that some of the recommendations made in the Coroner's report were linked to a report they completed owing to their concerns for public safety in and around waterways on Canal Street. They confirm that Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service support this scheme given the public safety concerns that they have previously raised. They state that they have experienced an increase in the number of 'Water Incidents' around Canal Street over the last 2-3 years & also experienced 2 fatal. They believe that any additional safety provisions that potentially reduce the number of water incidents has to be of benefit to public safety. The proposed barrier will not significantly impede any further attendance by fire crews should another incident occur on this stretch of water, and sufficient specialist equipment is carried by fire crews to deal with this type of incident.

The City Council has a land ownership interest in the land along the part of the canal that is the subject of this application and Members are reminded that in considering this matter, they are discharging their responsibility as Local Planning Authority and must disregard the City Council's ownership interest in the site.

Issues

The Unitary Development Plan for Manchester - The following UDP Policies is of relevance to this application:

- E3.6 Environmental Improvement and Protection - To Enhance the City's Environment - which states that the Council will promote environmental improvements in the City Centre that will significantly improve conditions for pedestrians.
- DC18.1 Conservation Areas - which states that the Council will seek to preserve and enhance the character and setting of its designated conservation areas.
- DC19.1 Listed Buildings - which states that the Council will seek to preserve or enhance the setting of listed buildings by

appropriate control over the design of new development in their vicinity.

National Policy - Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 - provides guidance on the protection of historic buildings and advises on the treatment of historic buildings and the wider historic environment within the planning process

Impact on the setting of the listed wall and character of the conservation area - The design process for the proposed fence has as detailed above, sought from the outset to minimise the impact of the fence on the setting of the adjacent listed wall and the setting of the conservation area. It is considered that the use of a post, rail and a glass solution would avoid any physical impact on the listed wall itself whilst maintaining the visibility of the wall within the street scene. The lightweight nature of the glass panels would be such that they would have minimal visual impact on the character or appearance of the wall whilst maintaining views through to the canal.

In view of the above it is felt that the proposed fence would not have an adverse impact on the character or fabric of the listed wall or its appearance within the street scene and would not have an adverse impact on the character of the Whitworth Street Conservation Area.

Impact on canal users and user safety - The access to the lock at Princess Street will not be affected by the proposals and the proposals will have no impact on the statutory right of navigation. There is no need for canal boat users (including horse boaters) to climb up from the canal over the canal wall onto Canal Street or vice versa as the lock 86 can be operated from a boat within the canal itself. Horse boating along a higher level towpath such as Canal Street requires one person to be in charge / control of the horse, one person to be in charge / control of the boat and ideally a third person to go ahead to set the next lock (or otherwise the person in charge of the boat).

The fence rail will be smooth and continuous and will cause much less, if any, abrasion when compared with the abrasion likely to be caused by a rope dragging over the rough surface/top of the wall.

The emergency services have confirmed that the fence will not impede their ability to rescue members of the public who have fallen into or have been pushed into the canal.

It should also be noted that some of the bars along Canal Street have been issued with throw lines for trained staff to use in the event of emergencies

Pedestrian Access - The proposed post and rail fence will not affect pedestrian access to the footway on the southern side of Canal Street. The erection of the fence should greatly improve pedestrian safety by removing the potential hazard of tripping and falling over the wall into the canal or onto one of the landing stages.

Pedestrian access to the canal towpath itself will remain as at present, i.e. via the footbridge opposite the New Union Hotel public house (at the junction of Canal Street and Princess Street) and via the ramp off the south-eastern corner of Minshull Street bridge. There is no pedestrian access to the various landing

stages along the Canal Street side of the canal. A secure access gate will allow access to the canal wall for canal maintenance operatives.

Disabled Access - The proposed post and rail fence will not have any impact on existing provision for disabled access along the towpath.

Crime and Disorder - The proposed fence could potentially be a target for acts of vandalism such as graffiti, attempted breakage of the glass and the display of posters, stickers and other similar materials. Following responses to consultations the scheme is to be amended such that the glass panels will be slightly angled as it is felt that this would be less attractive to people wishing to put fly posters or graffiti on the panels as they would not be viewed face on. Details of the amended treatment will be reported to Committee.

A cleaning programme will address issues of graffiti, stickers etc. In addition the glass panels would be angled to deter people from applying posters, stickers etc as they would not be viewed face on. The glass panels would be toughened glass which would resist minor impact damage and surface scratching and. If the glass were to be broken as a result of extreme force it would not shatter into shards of glass which may cause injury to people using the canal or be used for further acts of vandalism or violence by people frequenting Canal Street but it would craze and the fragments of glass would be held together.

A condition will be attached to any consent granted requiring the agreement of a cleaning and maintenance regime prior to any development commencing.

Panels Comments - The option of a simple rail attached to the wall or the use of a serrated edge would not meet the health and safety requirements in particular it is noted that a simple rail would not prevent people sitting on the wall particularly on the far side of the rail as this would allow for legs to be tucked under. In terms of the fence reflecting the changes in the wall level, it is felt that as the wall height does not slope gradually along the line of the wall but has sudden rises and falls due to some sharp changes in level, the corresponding sharply staggered appearance that this would have would not present an appropriate design solution in visual amenity terms. With respect to the use of a net or tension wires, the use of a net would involve a lot of work to the listed wall which could fracture or weaken it internally and would present a cleaning problem from litter and bird excrement whilst the use of tension wires, would not only would create the same type of issues as regards the walls structural integrity but may themselves, by nature of their construction injure people falling into the canal.

Objector's Concerns - Most of the material issues raised by objectors have been considered above.

In terms of the comments about access for maintenance, access to the canal and the canal side of the wall and the canal retaining wall it stands on will continue to be from the canal. On rare occasions British Waterways' staff may require access to a small discrete section of upper canal wall via the Canal Street access gate.

With respect to the comments about the cost and appropriateness of spending money on such a solution it should be noted that there have been several

incidents along Canal Street in recent years resulting in fatalities or serious injury following a fall from height into the canal or onto one of the lock-side areas. The fence is intended to minimise the risk of such incidents reoccurring in the future. Falling from height from the wall is an obvious hazard. The wall is so low at points it is possible to trip and fall over the wall. Many people sit on the wall which appears low at Canal Street but has a significant drop on the other side. Many incidents have involved falling backwards off the wall onto a hard landing stage or into the canal.

In terms of the issue raised about the ability of people to throw litter into the canal being unaltered by the fence, this was not a parameter to be considered as part of the design process.

Conclusion

Whilst the primary objective of the proposal is to seek to minimise the number of incidents along Canal Street resulting in fatalities or serious injury following a fall from height into the canal or onto one of the lock-side areas, in assessing the merits of this application, careful consideration has been given to the visual impact of the fence in the context of its location as well as the impact that the fence will have on both canal users and pedestrians and those using the canal street area.

As outlined above the fence will not hinder or interfere with the ability of canal users to navigate the canal. In addition there will be no impact on pedestrian access to the canal towpath and indeed it can be argued as detailed above that the erection of the fence would improve pedestrian safety. In terms of the visual impact of the fence it is considered that the fence would not have an adverse impact on the character or fabric of the listed wall or its appearance within the street scene and would not have an adverse impact on the character of the Whitworth Street Conservation Area.

In view of the above it is considered that on balance the proposed fence is acceptable.

Human Rights Act 1998 considerations – 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.

Protocol 1 Article 1, and Article 8 where appropriate, 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)/objector(s)/resident(s) 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 the 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.

Recommendation APPROVE

on the basis that the proposals subject to compliance with the conditions below, generally accord with the policies contained within the Development Plan, specifically the Unitary Development Plan Policies Policy E3.6, DC18.1 DC19.1, and with PPG15 in that the proposals would will improve pedestrian safety along this stretch of the Rochdale Canal, would not have an adverse impact on the character or fabric of the listed wall or its appearance within the street scene, would not have an adverse impact on the character of the Whitworth Street Conservation Area.

Conditions and/or Reasons

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) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority:

Site plan stamped as received on 23-04-09, dwg 0066/BPO –08-2, 015-01, 015-02 and 000000-001-01 Rev A

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.

3) No development that is hereby approved shall commence until details of the colour of the steel supports and top rail have been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The development shall be constructed only using the approved colour 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, as specified in policy H2.2; of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

4) No development that is hereby approved shall commence until details of a cleaning and maintenance scheme for the fence has been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The cleaning and the maintenance of the fence shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme at all times that the fence is in situ.

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, as specified in policy H2.2; of the 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 ref: 089880/V0/2009/C2 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 held by the Planning Division.

The following residents, businesses and other third parties in the area were consulted/notified on the application:

Environment & Operations (Highway Authority)
City Centre Renegeration
British Waterways Board
Greater Manchester Police
Rochdale Canal Society Ltd
Village Business Association
Aspect In The City, Cambos House, 3 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3HE
Red Vision, Cambos House, 3 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3HE
Velvet, 2 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3HE
Unit Communications Group Ltd, 1 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3HE
Greater Manchester Probation Service, 12 Minshull Street, Manchester, M1 3FR
Flat 5, 10 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 2, 10 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 6, 10 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 8, 10 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 3, 10 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 7, 10 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 1, 10 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Autobahn, 10 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 4, 10 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Pragues, 40 Chorlton Street, Manchester, M1 3HW
41 Chorlton Street, Manchester, M1 3FY
Cheshire Sporting Club Ltd, 11 Bloom Street, Manchester, M1 3HH
The Churchill, 37 Chorlton Street, Manchester, M1 3HN
Slug & Lettuce, 4 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3HE
Media Mission Ltd, 5 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3HF
Gillett & Bevan Ltd, 5 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3HF
Flat 24, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 44, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 25, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 35, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 45, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 53, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 41, Canal Court, 18 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 26, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 36, Canal Court, 18 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 63, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 65, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 34, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ

49 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
47 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
45 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
Shacter Cohen & Bor, 29-31, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
Tyler Frazer, 25 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3NB
The Rembrandt Hotel, 33 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3LZ
Manto, 46 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3WD
Janus, Amazon House, 3 Brazil Street, Manchester, M1 3EG
Eden Bar & Grill, Amazon House, 3 Brazil Street, Manchester, M1 3PW
E Mesrie & Sons Ltd, Amazon House, 3 Brazil Street, Manchester, M1 3PJ
Business In The Community, Amazon House, 3 Brazil Street, Manchester, M1 3PW
Makin Architecture, Amazon House, 3 Brazil Street, Manchester, M1 3PW
Flat 42, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 2, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 6, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 1, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 44, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 5, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 3, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 33, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 26, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 16, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Spirit, 63 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
New Union Hotel, 111 Princess Street, Manchester, M1 6JB
Flat 22, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 61, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 64, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 32, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 54, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 42, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 23, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Via Fossa Cafe Bar, 28-30, Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 46, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 55, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 33, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 51, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 62, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 56, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 52, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 31, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 21, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
Flat 43, Canal Court, 28 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3EZ
43 Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
Vanilla Cafe Bar, 39-41, Richmond Street, Manchester, M1 3WB
40 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3WD
34 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3WD
K D P, 36 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3WD
Universal Language Centre, 36 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3WD
Rembrandt Annex, 38 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3WD
42 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3WD
Mctucky Fried Chicken, 40 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3WA
Flat 43, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF

Flat 12, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 7, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 17, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 36, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 25, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 23, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 21, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 4, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 35, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 24, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 22, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 11, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 15, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 31, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 41, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 34, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 32, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF
Flat 14, 42-44, Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3NF

Representations were received from the following third parties:

Greater Manchester Police

Tower Farmhouse, Shillingee, Chiddingfold,, GODALMING, Surrey, GU8 4SY
2 Rock Bank, Stamford Road, Mossley, Greater Manchester, OL5 0BD
11 Brackenpeth Mews, Great Park, NE3 5RS
Goldings Barn, Bowcombe Rd, Carisbrooke, , PO303HT
1 Reades Piece, Honeybourne, Evesham, Worcs, WR11 7GA
Swan yr Afon, LLANWRDA, Carmarthenshire, SA19 8AA
16 Hale Road Heckington Sleaford, NG34 9JW
9 hounsdow close, totton, southampton, SO40 9EW
46 Gloucester Road, Chesterfield, S41 7EG
351 Mount Road, Manchester, , , M19 3HW
3 Main Street, Sproxtton, Melton Mowbray, LE14 4QS

Charlotte Rose, Doncaster, South Yorkshire

1 Reades Piece, Honeybourne, Evesham, Worcs, WR11 7GA
21 Wellington Close, Dibden Purlieu, Southampton, Hants, SO45 4RL
40 Valeside, Hertford, sg14 2as
Cronkshaw Fold Farm, Alden Rd , Rossendale, BB4 4AQ
45 Minster Court, Liverpool, L7 3QD
12 Kenyon Cl, HYDE, SK14 4JH
10 bromley avenue, flixton, m41 6hz
8 Dr Johnson House, 1a Babington Road, London, SW16 6AQ
Germaines UK, Hansa Road, Kings Lynn, PE30 4LG
37 Chaucer Road, Hillside, Rugby, Warwickshire, CV22 5 RP
40 Fifth Avenue, CM1 4HD
22 Belfry Drive, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK10 2TD
64 Oughtrington Lane, Lymm , Cheshire, WA130QT
Horizon, Longhaven, Peterhead, AB42 0NY
Hole House Farm Cottage, Marple Road, Chisworth, Glossop, Sk135dh
5 Calder Road, Bellsquarry, Livingston, West Lothian, EH54 9AA
sea scouts, dunkirk road , nottingham, ng7 2ph

68 Ingham Street, Padiham, Lancashire, BB12 8DR
46 South Street, Torrington, Devon, EX38 8AB
Tresco,, Old Stafford Road,, Slade Heath,, Wolverhampton, WV10 7PJ
Goldings Barn, Bowcombe Rd, Carisbrooke, , po30 3ht
30 Tenby Drive, Cheadle Hulme, Cheadle, , SK8 7BR
84 Broken Cross, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK11 8TZ
Flat 306, The Grand, 1 Aytoun Street, Manchester, , , M1 3DA
24 Sydney Road, Benfleet, Essex, SS7 5RD
Apt 111 Asia House, 82 Princess Street, Manchester, M1 6BD
Flat 21, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, , , M1 3NF
Laburnum Cottage, Peckforton Hall Lan, Tarporley, Cheshire, , CW69tg
9 North Street, Marton, , CV23 9RJ
17 Holland Road, East Ham, London, E6 2EW
Narrowboat Jy Praat Twak, n/a
River View, Leighs Brow, Barnton, Northwich, CW8 4HT, CW8 4HT
Flat 43, 42 - 44 Sackville Street, Manchester, , , M1 3NF
6 The Tennis, Cassington, Witney, Oxon, OX29 4EL
70 Babington Road, Barrow upon Soar, Leicestershire, LE128NJ

Relevant Contact Officer : Angela Leckie
Telephone number : 0161 234 4651
Email : a.leckie@manchester.gov.uk