

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL
REPORT FOR RESOLUTION

<u>Committee</u>	PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS
<u>Date</u>	24 July 2008
<u>Subject</u>	085708/FO/2008/N2 Residential development comprising 575 units (230 houses and 345 apartments) within buildings between two and twelve storeys in height, an A1/A3 retail unit (422 square metres) and associated highways, open space, car parking, landscaping and public realm infrastructure
<u>Location</u>	Olympic Freight Container Depot And M & A Demolition, Bennett Street, West Gorton, Manchester, M12 5NL,
<u>Applicant</u>	Braidwater Ltd, C/o Agent
<u>Agent</u>	Turley Associates The Chancery, 58 Spring Gardens, Manchester, M2 1EW
<u>Report of</u>	HEAD OF PLANNING

Purpose of report

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

Recommendation

The Head of Planning recommends that the Committee REFUSE planning application **085708/FO/2008/N2** relating to Residential development comprising 575 units (230 houses and 345 apartments) within buildings between two and twelve storeys in height, an A1/A3 retail unit (422 square metres) and associated highways, open space, car parking, landscaping and public realm infrastructure 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)

Derek Jones

0161-234-4522
d.jones5@manchester.gov.uk

Jeni Wilson

0161 234 4164

j.wilson3@manchester.gov.uk

Background Documents

Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Developments (2005)
Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (2006)
Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management (2005)
Planning Policy Guidance Note 13: Transport (2001)
Planning Policy Guidance Note 17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation (2002)
Regional Planning Guidance for the North West RPG13 (2003) – Policies DP2, DP3, UR1 and UR7
Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West (draft) – Policy MCR2
Unitary Development Plan (1995) – Policies AB1, AB4, DC7, R1.1, H1.2, H2.1, H2.7, E1.2, E3.5, E3.7, T2.6 and T3.1
Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance (April 2007).
Manchester City Council Interim Policy Residential Developments (2006)
New East Manchester Strategic Regeneration Framework (2008)

Consultations Completed:

MEDC Landscape Practice Group
New East Manchester
Greater Manchester Police (Architectural Liaison Officers)
Greater Manchester Police (Crime Reduction Officers)
Head of Engineering Services
Head of Regulatory and Enforcement Services (Pollution Section)
Head of Regulatory and Enforcement Services (Contaminated Land Section)
Environment & Operations (Trees)
Environment & Operations (Highways)
United Utilities
Environment Agency
Green City Team
English Heritage (NW Region)
Greater Manchester Geological Unit
Director of Housing
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
Lancashire Wildlife Trust
Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit
British Waterways Board
North West Regional Assembly
GMPTE
Commission For Architecture And The Built Environment
Natural England
Inland Waterways Association

Consultation Responses from:

New East Manchester
Greater Manchester Police

Head of Engineering Services
Head of Regulatory and Enforcement Services (Pollution Section)
Head of Regulatory and Enforcement Services (Contaminated Land Section)
Environment & Operations (Trees)
United Utilities
Environment Agency
English Heritage (NW Region)
Greater Manchester Geological Unit
British Waterways Board
North West Regional Assembly
GMPTE
Commission For Architecture And The Built Environment
Natural England

Third Party Notifications:

See attached plan for map showing the properties notified of the application.

Third Party Representations

David Andrew, GM Recovery, Brook Business Complex, Bennett Street, West Gorton, Manchester, M12 5AQ

Mrs D Whittaker, Chair Of The Bennett Street Tenants And Residents Association, 15 Rostron Avenue, West Gorton, Manchester, M12 5LQ

Wards affected

Ardwick Ward

Implications for:

Anti-poverty	Equal Opportunities	Environment	Employment
YES	YES	YES	YES

-

Introduction

The application site is located within the north western corner of the West Gorton Masterplan area, which forms part of the New East Manchester Strategic Regeneration Framework. The site is currently occupied by the Olympic Freight Container Site and M&A Demolition Yard on Bennett Street, immediately surrounded by existing residential properties. As there has been a history of problems associated with these uses due to noise, dust and the movement of heavy goods vehicles. Therefore, the Strategic Regeneration Framework recommends the relocation of these businesses and the redevelopment of the site for residential purposes. It is considered that a high quality residential development in this location will provide new homes for the residents wanting to move into this area of Manchester, whilst also greatly improving the environment and amenity for those residents who already live in the West Gorton area.

In response to the recommendations made within the West Gorton masterplan, Braidwater Ltd. have put forward a planning application for the redevelopment of this site for residential development, with a small element of retail provision onto Bennett Street.

The Application Site

The application site measures 5.24 hectares (12.9 acres) in size and is located within the Ardwick ward of Manchester approximately 2.5km from the City Centre. Although the site is located within the Ardwick ward, it is known locally as the West Gorton area of East Manchester.

The site is bordered to the north by a linear car parking area used by the Great Universal House office development, which is accessed from under the railway viaduct. Beyond the car park is a railway line branching east from the main line. The main line and viaduct immediately bound the site to the west and form a significant barrier along the western edge of the application site.

Existing residential properties then bound the site to the east and south. To the east of the site is the Guinness Trust housing development with two storey houses located on Hayfield Close and Anthony Close. Bennett Street then forms the boundary to the south, with existing two storey properties fronting and on Ercall Avenue.

The area is very mixed in nature, with predominantly residential properties in existing estates, but with some commercial, industrial, educational, community and leisure uses within it. The surrounding area has several listed buildings including the former St Benedict's Church on Bennett Street, and Nicholls House on Hyde Road.

The Development Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a mixed residential and retail scheme across the 5.24 hectare site. The proposal includes 575 residential units of accommodation, consisting of 345 apartments (60%) and 230 houses (40%). The mix of accommodation would be in 130 one bed units, 224 two bed units and 221 three bedroom units, within 5 different house types and apartments. In addition to the residential accommodation, it is also proposed to provide 422 sqm of retail floorspace within the ground floor of the apartments block fronting Bennett Street.

The proposed density for the development is 110 dwellings per hectare within buildings ranging from three storeys up to twelve storeys in height. The scheme predominantly includes the provision of three storey houses across the site, with apartments buildings from four storeys up to a twelve storey tower located to the west of the application site. There also includes a five storey multi storey car parking facility, a linear park along the railway viaduct and a 63 metre high relocated radio mast.

The masterplan for the site includes primary circulation through an inner loop road, secondary roads and cul-de-sacs and a central avenue. Vehicular access to the site would be taken directly from Bennett Street, which connects into the

major radial route of Hyde Road. Car parking is being provided at one space per residential dwelling and will consist of the following:

Houses:	64 spaces (10%) in curtilage to the front of the dwelling 190 spaces (30%) on street parking 26 spaces (4%) on street visitor car parking
Apartments:	45 spaces (8%) ground floor undercroft parking 300 spaces (48%) multi storage car parking (5 floors)

Amenity space is being provided for dwellings through a small private area in the form of a garden or balcony, and public space in the linear park, village greens, courtyards and roof terraces.

Environmental Statement

An Environmental Statement (ES) has been submitted considering the following issues:

- Effect on Humans – Population, Transport, Noise and Vibration, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Recreation and Community Facilities, Utilities and Services, Telecommunications, Resources, Construction Management, Waste Management, Hydrology and Flood Risk and Archaeology.
- Effects on Flora, Fauna and Geology – Ecology and Ground Conditions.
- Effect on Land.
- Effect on Air and Climate – Air Quality, Daylight and Sunlight and Wind Assessment.
- Socio-Economic Considerations.
- Interaction of Effects and Cumulative Effects.

Planning Submission

The following documents were submitted for consideration as part of application 085708/FO/2008/N2:

- Planning Application Forms
- Site Edge Red Ref: BRAM1012
- Various Master plans, Zone Plans, Floor Plans and Elevations (proposed and existing).
- Landscape Masterplans, Public Realm drawings and Sections
- Planning Statement
- Design and Access Statement – including Waste Management Strategy, Landscape Design, Energy Assessment, Design for Access 2 audit and a Crime Impact Statement
- Environmental Statement
- Environmental Statement Technical Appendices – including a Transport Assessment, Noise Survey, Drainage Strategy, Waste Strategy, Flood Risk Assessment, Archaeology Assessment, Ecological Assessment, Bat Survey, Tree Survey Report, Ground Contamination Report, Daylight/Sunlight Assessment and a Wind Assessment.
- Environmental Statement Non Technical Summary

- Sustainability Appraisal – including the Environmental and Sustainability Checklist Criteria.
- Statement of Community Involvement

City Council Interest

The City Council has an interest in this site as a land owner solely in connection with adjoining highways.

Consultations

Local Residents/Businesses

One letter of objection was received from a local business and one letter was received from the Bennett Street Tenants and Residents Association. The comments made can be summarised as follows:

- 1) The residents of Bennett Street object to the plans submitted for application 085708/FO/2008/N2. The objections concern the five storey car park and three and four storey dwelling units along Bennett Street. It is unacceptable to expect residents to be overlooked in this way.
- 2) At previous meetings with Braidwater, these concerns were raised and Braidwater assured residents that these views would be taken into consideration. It appears that's they have completely disregarded residents views.
- 3) Would also object to investor sales and a clause should be put in place to resist this.
- 4) The Bennett Street road surface is presently dangerous and in a poor state of repair. The increase in traffic caused by this development and contractors vehicles will increase the degradation on the road and it should be repaired.
- 5) Question if there is any intention to improve the traffic management within the area with the increases involved with the new development, possibly through the installation of traffic lights at the Hyde Road and Bennett Street junction?

New East Manchester

New East Manchester is engaged with a number of key partners to bring forward a masterplan for the delivery of a holistic regeneration programme across the West Gorton area. Part of this work has included ongoing dialogue with the applicants, Braidwater Ltd. The present application, however, does not reflect our regeneration objectives for this site within the broader West Gorton area, notably in respect of the following:

- a) NEM does not believe that the density of this development is appropriate for the size of the site and believes that 575 units amounts to overdevelopment.

b) NEM are not happy with the mix of residential units with over 50% being apartment accommodation and do not believe that this mix sits well in a predominantly family-orientated neighbourhood.

c) NEM have additional concerns about how the proposed discrete car parking, sited to the south of the site, relates to the proximity of the residential accommodation it is intended to serve.

d) Further, NEM have concerns about how this development relates to existing houses on Bennett Street and indeed how it links to masterplanning proposals for the wider area, which were approved by Manchester City Council in March of this year.

From a regeneration perspective therefore, NEM is unable to support this planning application.

Greater Manchester Police

GMP was requested to produce a Crime Impact Statement by the Architects of the scheme. Part A was submitted highlighting generic issues. However the document is not complete, as Part B needs to be completed. GMP have not been asked to do so, and must advise that the Crime Impact Statement is therefore inconclusive. Suffice to say the submitted scheme will not achieve the Secured By Design award.

GMP are mindful of the problems currently experienced in this area and are regretful to advise that they strongly OBJECT to this application for the following reasons:-

1) GMP are concerned the number of units suggested for the site will provide a dense planning regime impacting adversely upon traffic and pedestrian flows, which could lead to conflict. Such densities will limit the location of interrelated parking e.g. parking areas in-curtilage or close to resident's properties without the need for dedicated off-site or multi-storey parking. This seems inappropriate as residents always need and desire to park vehicles 'close to home' and the fear of crime will be unnecessarily exaggerated.

2) The provision of the home zones in this proposal incorporates dense parking. Unfortunately, the roads lack appropriate control (vehicular crossings) at points of access onto the Home-Zones and at the junctions. This will generate conflict and may lead to accidents between vehicles and pedestrians

3) GMP are concerned about the criminal under-culture locally, which has manifested in a high rate of local burglaries to new housing estates nearby.

4) Many new buy-to-let properties locally have been targeted as landlords are not prepared to incorporate appropriate fencing to boundaries etc. and tenants cannot afford to pay. Consequently repeat attacks are common as the landlords cannot afford to repair the damage.

5) Intimidation and youths causing annoyance (YCA) locally considerably impedes the life style of responsible residents. Any new development must be

cognisant of the potential problems to badly constructed local new-build properties and ensure boundary treatment and target hardening is robust.

6) Pedestrian permeability should not be at the expense of unauthorised accessibility. Permeable routes through the site must be well controlled and properties should be protected from footways by 'defensible spaces'. This has not been appropriately provided on this scheme.

7) The site is not far from remote businesses which have suffered robberies and have no surveillance due to their location, as well as the bus depot on Devonshire Street. The site is adjacent to a current hotspot for burglary/vehicle crime and some offenders live close to this location. This highlights the need to maximise secure provision on the site.

8) Perimeter controls/courtyard parking in particular needs to be well managed i.e. a management company. Electronic gates on Division have been broken rendering the premises insecure and vulnerable and encourages anti-social behaviour (ASB).

9) Balconies creating ladders for crime opportunities. We must ensure footholds are designed out.

10) Looking towards detailed work, it has been proven that window restrictors on apartment blocks have not worked satisfactorily and careful attention is required to minimise the impact on burglaries.

11) Access control to apartments is of primary concern. Poor products provide easy access into large developments.

12) Mail boxes - details of the siting and design are paramount to determine if security of residents mail is likely to be breached.

13) A robust and dedicated CCTV monitoring system must be established, that will provide footage for prosecution purposes to the police if needed, for evidential purposes.

14) Exposure of the building to vandalism and attack of the shell allowing criminals to explore the weaknesses of the site & building must be limited by providing appropriate physical boundary treatment. This is not appropriately designed, configured or identified on the submitted plans.

15) Tailgating by cars accessing the multi-storey car parks without authority in order to steal cars and their contents or attack persons in the confined space of the car park, must be eliminated. I will require an 'air-lock' or double control strategy to minimise illegal access.

16) GMP are concerned about prevailing criminal damage and anti-social behaviour locally. We will require a good level of sterile zones or defensible managed space around apartment blocks. This is not appropriately provided in most apartment blocks - e.g. Block M

17) A new development will potentially attract criminals from surrounding areas and secure 'target hardening' must be employed.

18) Sterile or defensible spaces at ground level must be established to houses and apartments to provide the resident with the ability to 'control' their space.

19) GMP object to the provision of blank exposed gables onto the street.- they generate noise nuisance and ASB. A 'defensible sterile area' is required to the perimeter of all homes.

20) Public open spaces must be appropriately modelled and landscaped to minimise the misuse of games, which could antagonize and annoy local residents. The rise of skate-boarding is an example of how wide open hard spaces can be misused to the detriment of the residents wishing to adopt a peaceful life style.

21) 'Grinding' - the practice of skate-boarding on the arises of steps/ seats etc is not only annoying and causes conflict it damages landscaped features. GMP will require anti-grinding measures to be employed. e.g. steps and seating - Drg. D100 004-1

22) To avoid persons misusing long seating areas we will require physical divisional barriers (seat width) along the seating strip (drg. No. D 100 004 -3)

23) Car parking should where possible be in curtilage - the most desirable location for residents - even within a garage. Small controllable courtyards can be secured to minimise owner's fear of crime.

24) Lighting columns in public spaces should be approx 8m. high. Drg No. D 100 004-2 illustrates a low level column. Atmosphere lighting should be not less than 5m.

25) GMP strongly object to deck access apartments as they generate misuse and noise and nuisance. However, the provision of small numbers of properties accessible via a dedicated controlled access could be acceptable.

26) Block C incorporates bridges/ undercroft pedestrian access points which generate noise nuisance and annoyance as persons gather under these weather protected structures. They should be removed from the scheme.

27) Access between apartment blocks must be eliminated - e.g. Block C. Each block should have their own dedicated access with robust access-control measures in place.

28) Block C has been designed with a thoroughfare passing between apartment blocks. This will encourage misuse and an unbalanced use of space as residents will adopt the private access less than pedestrians, short-cutting through the site. Such areas must be dedicated to residents and their guests only.

29) The car park court to Block C, which leads to undercroft parking, is too deep with too many vehicles and its use will cause unnecessary conflict. Access to the undercroft should be separately provided.

30) Access doors are fitted to the walls of the properties e.g. appt. C-AP-00-14. The constant use of the door will bang and vibrate in the apartment and potentially generate conflict. This must be avoided.

31) All external doors to common lobbies must open outwards.

32) The external front gardens of houses - e.g. House Types 05 - should incorporate low railings and gates to provide defensible spaces.

33) Laminated glass is essential to all ground level and accessible upper level glazing units.

The scheme as submitted WILL NOT ACHIEVE THE SECURED BY DESIGN AWARD. The scheme should be designed to meet the standards of the Secured By Design Award.

Head of Engineering Services

Following receipt of the application documents, officers have looked at the transport issues surrounding the site, specifically the proposed new junction on Hyde Road.

Officers engaged in a pre-plan discussion and a number of suggestions were made about the estimated traffic generation, the distribution of traffic and the likely mitigation works needed, and shared spaces within the application site. Suggestions were also made regarding shared spaces and the need for 2m 'safe' footways delineated by a minimum 50mm upstand (small kerb) to correspond with requirements from Design For Access 2.

Looking at the submission documentation it is noted that some comments have been incorporated. However, the work on modelling of the future traffic scenarios at the proposed Hyde Road junction require further analysis. Comments have been made about a number of required amendments and corrections to the layout and modelling and a response to this is still awaited. It is imperative that a satisfactory junction design and accurate modelling is produced and submitted for approval.

Some further general points on the submission documents relating to the street layouts and parking:

a) There is little discussion on the extent of new highway to be adopted - the main internal loop road is highlighted as a 'Main Route' and providing an 'Axis' to the estate, but there is no indication of the intention to adopt. Materials and design for adopted roads will need full consultation with MEDC prior to work on site.

b) Roadways throughout the development are narrow. Access on secondary routes is constrained and servicing/ removal vehicles will struggle to negotiate. The 'Avenue' proposed in the plans could not be adopted due to the narrow width (frequent 3.0m pinch-points), which would only realistically permit one-way working and, the unusual culvert system provided as part of the SUDS. These would cause safety concerns for pedestrians/children.

c) The multi-storey car park solution for the flat developments would present problems for disabled users, a distance of 200m from dwelling to parking space seems excessive (worst case). It is likely that car users resident in the blocks of flats will park in available on-street bays, creating competition and potential conflict for them.

d) Despite high levels of on-street parking across the site, it is not clear whether parking is provided for the retail element- tree pits are shown but spaces are not indicated. This is likely to be the crucial area to provide some space for short-term parking, especially as the location is at the 'gateway' to the development.

e) Following complaints made by a local business about surfacing; a footway and carriageway resurfacing condition is recommended and/or a significant contribution for surfacing/repair of existing highway.

Head of Regulatory and Enforcement Services (Pollution Section)

The application has been assessed and the following comments can be made:

1) Refuse - The information provided does not meet the City Council's waste guidance requirements.

2) Noise - The information provided within the Environmental Statement is not sufficient. Further information is required on how the appropriate internal noise criterion will be achieved. Confirmation is required as to whether the L_{max} levels stated in 7.3.34 are for daytime or night time hours or both. Also, the applicant needs to demonstrate what levels will actually be achieved in the bedrooms and living rooms with the various glazing and ventilation proposed.

3) External Equipment - Section 7.3.65 of the ES explains what limits to any plant should be applied, but it does not detail how the relevant noise levels below the existing background in each octave band will be achieved.

The following conditions should also be included; Acoustic insulation of the A1/A3 unit, limit on the delivery/servicing hours of the A1/A3 unit, limit of opening hours of the A1/A3 unit and the submission of details in relation to the proposed fume extraction equipment.

Head of Regulatory and Enforcement Services (Contaminated Land Section)

The Contaminated Land Section has reviewed the above information in order to assess the following points: 1) The adequacy of the desk study information available for this site, 2) The adequacy of the site investigation, and 3) The adequacy of the final risk assessment.

The site is currently occupied by a container storage depot and demolition contractor works. Most of the site is covered in hardstanding materials and cobbles. Previous land use includes a field with residential buildings overlying part of the Corn Brook. Later an iron foundry, sidings, ponds and transport depot were present. Manchester City Football Ground was located south of the site. Adjacent land use included open fields, Ardwick Railway Station, brick and lime fields, chemical and dye works, a housing estate, tram and bus depots along with timber and saw mills. The site does not lie within 250 metres of a

registered landfill site, and the nearest surface watercourse is Cringle Brook 238 metres away. The site lies above the Collyhurst and Sherwood Sandstone major aquifer.

1. The adequacy of the desk study information available for this site - The desk study information appears to be adequate.
2. The adequacy of the site investigation and risk assessment - The site investigation appears to be adequate, however the risk assessment appears inadequate.
3. It is stated in the report that remedial measures will be required and should be supported by undertaking a detailed risk assessment. Remediation proposals include importing clean topsoil, removing contaminants from site, installation of a capping layer, bioremediation (using a biopile) or thermal and chemical treatment. Any remediation proposals should be submitted to this section in the form of a Remediation Strategy.

Environment & Operations (Trees)

There is a mature Willow in good condition opposite Ercall Avenue and a mixture of Sorbus and Acers within the grounds with little amenity value. As the replacement numbers will more than compensate for these removals, there is no objection to the removals.

United Utilities

United Utilities have no objection to the proposal providing this site must be drained on a separate system, with only foul drainage connected into the foul sewer. Foul drainage from this development is to be limited to 30 litres per second. Surface water should be discharged via the culvert that runs beneath the site and discharges to the River Medlock. The applicant must discuss full details of the site drainage proposals with United Utilities. Land drainage or subsoil drainage water must not be connected into the public sewer system directly or by way of private drainage pipes. It is the developer's responsibility to provide adequate land drainage without recourse to the use of the public sewer system. Deep rooted shrubs and trees should not be planted in the vicinity of the public sewer and overflow systems. Our water mains may need extending to serve any development on this site. The applicant, who may be required to pay a capital contribution, will need to sign an Agreement under Sections 41, 42 & 43 of the Water Industry Act 1991. A separate metered supply to each unit will be required at the applicant's expense and all internal pipe work must comply with current water supply (water fittings) regulations 1999.

Environment Agency

The Environment Agency has no objection in principle to the proposed development subject to the inclusion of conditions, which meet the following requirements; 1) surface water regulation, 2) buildings 1, 2 and 3, and the railway arches have been surveyed for evidence of use by bats prior to demolition, and 3) a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site. The Environment Agency has reviewed the White Young Green Ground Contamination Desk Top Study Report (dated Dec. 2006)

and the Phase II Geo-Environmental Ground Investigation Interpretative Report (dated January 2008) for Bennett Street, Ardwick, Manchester. However it is considered that the level of information provided in relation to impacts on the surface water courses at the site is not sufficient at this stage to determine whether remedial works will be required. An informative and a further recommendation is also included in relation to the two culverted watercourses that cross the site.

English Heritage (NW Region)

This is an application that might affect the setting of two highly graded listed buildings, and evaluation of this effect should be required.

The site is equidistant between two Grade II* listed buildings; the former Nichol's Hospital / Ellen Wilkinson High School on Hyde Road, and St. Benedict's former church on Bennett Street. It is not possible to tell from the information supplied with the application what effect, if any, the proposals will have on the setting of these two buildings. This might be considerable, in light of the fact that the tallest element is of 12 storeys, while most of the buildings in the surrounding area are of 2-3 storeys.

English Heritage recommend that prior to determination, further information is produced to demonstrate the visual impact that the tallest elements of the proposals will have on these two buildings. This should include agreed viewpoints, in particular of long views of these buildings from major transport routes into the City. English Heritage would welcome the opportunity of advising further.

Greater Manchester Geological Unit

The proposals include residential, retail and landscaping. This type of application would normally fall outside the SLA remit in which GMGU provide advice on minerals and waste related planning issues. Records held by GMGU indicate that there are no waste management facilities within the immediate neighbourhood of the proposed development. However, it is recommended that the Council assess their own records to ensure that any existing waste management facilities bordering the site do not become 'bad neighbours'.

However, as this proposal involves a site of 5.6 hectares there is a strong likelihood that it would produce significant quantities of construction and demolition waste. In April 2008 Site Waste Management Plans (SWMPs) need to be submitted by a developer for projects valued at over £300,000. SWMPs help to manage and reduce the amount of waste that construction projects produce and that means less waste going to landfill. There are many other environmental benefits including less harm to the local environment, less fly tipping, reduced energy consumption and a greater take-up of recycled materials. It may also be appropriate for the developer to assess the potential for exploiting any mineral resource on site prior to its potential sterilisation.

Owing to the wider social and environmental impacts of such a major project it is considered that the inclusion of the applicant's SWMP would be appropriate in the submission of any Environmental Statement.

British Waterways Board

British Waterways have no comments to make.

North West Regional Assembly

In terms of the overall number of units the Assembly (NWRA) do not have any objections, as the total housing number is a small proportion of the (annual) average figure for Manchester as a whole. The Assembly (NWRA) welcome the fact that the site is within the Manchester Salford Pathfinder area and the site is situated on previously developed land.

The NWRA have noted that the Planning Application does not take provision for affordable housing however the application does state that 'potential financial models' are being investigated to create ways of allowing people to access home ownership; The NWRA welcome this approach. As Manchester is currently in the process of adopting an affordable housing policy, we would like to emphasise, that due to the scale of this development you may like to consider whether it is appropriate to secure units of 'affordable provision' as part of this application; this would be a key driver in terms of the implementation of Manchester's affordable housing policy.

GMPTE

The site is well located in relation to public transport being within walking distance of the bus stops on Bennett Street and Hyde Road. Bus stops on Bennett Street provide access to a half hourly local service to Manchester and bus stops on the Hyde Road Quality Bus Corridor provide access to more frequent services to a number of destinations including Manchester, Denton, Hyde, Reddish and Stockport. Future residents of the proposed development would therefore have access to a choice of travel mode, which should help to reduce the amount of car travel otherwise generated by this development. Furthermore the use of this site for high density residential development is also supported as it maximises the benefits of the site's public transport accessibility. In order to maximise the benefits of the site's location in relation to the public transport facilities, it should be ensured that the pedestrian environment is designed to be as safe and convenient as possible so as not to discourage people from accessing the site on foot / by public transport. This should be applied both throughout the site and also between the site and the nearby bus stops; and can be achieved through measures such as the appropriate use of surfacing materials, landscaping, lighting, signage and road crossings. Although the site is accessible by public transport, it is important to influence people's travel patterns at the beginning of occupation. GMPTE would therefore expect a Travel Plan to accompany this planning application in order to encourage future occupants to use sustainable modes of travel.

Commission For Architecture And The Built Environment

Due to limited resources, CABE are unable to comment on this proposal.

Natural England

Natural England is a statutory agency charged with the responsibility to ensure that England's unique natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

NE is not aware of any nationally designated landscapes or any statutorily designated areas of nature conservation importance that would be significantly affected by the proposed planning application. NE are also satisfied that the proposal does not have any significant impacts upon Natural England's other interests, including National Trails, Access Land, or the areas of search for new national landscape designations.

NE note that the information provided identifies that there is a potential to impact bats and birds and their habitats in carrying out the development works. Bats are protected under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and under the Conservation (Natural Habitats, & c) Regulations 1994 and the developer must comply with the law in that if at any time a bat or droppings or other indicative signs are found, work must stop immediately and further advice must then be sought before any further works are carried out, whether the bats are still present or not. All species of wild bird, their nests and eggs are protected under Section 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and, amongst other things it is an offence to, with certain exceptions, intentionally or recklessly: kill, injure or take any wild bird; take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while it is in use or being built; take or destroy the egg of any wild bird. NE recommend that demolition works are completed outside the bird nesting season to avoid the potential risk to bird species such as House Sparrow and Starling, which may well use such buildings for nesting.

Natural England would strongly urge that opportunities are taken to create habitat in the design.

Issues

The report will begin by outlining all the relevant National, Regional and Local Policies and Guidance to this planning application.

Relevant National Policies

Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Developments (2005)

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.

PPS1 clearly indicates that good planning ensures that we get the right development, in the right place and at the right time. But poor planning can result in a legacy for current and future generations of run-down town centres,

unsafe and dilapidated housing, and crime and disorder. Sustainable development is the core principle underpinning planning and this can be defined as development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

PPS1 goes on to state that planning should facilitate and promote sustainable and inclusive patterns of urban development by ensuring high quality development through good and inclusive design and ensuring that development supports existing communities and contributes to the creation of safe, sustainable, liveable and mixed communities with good access to jobs and key services for all members of the community. Local Authorities should promote development that creates socially inclusive communities, including suitable mixes of housing. Development should deliver safe, healthy and attractive places to live.

PPS1 places great emphasis on Design and states that good design ensures attractive usable, durable and adaptable places and is a key element in achieving sustainable development. Authorities should strive to achieve high quality and inclusive design from all developments, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes. Good design should contribute positively to making places better for people. Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted. High quality and inclusive design should create well-mixed and integrated developments which avoid segregation and have well-planned public spaces that bring people together and provide opportunities for physical activity and recreation. It means ensuring a place will function well and add to the overall character and quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development.

Therefore, to conclude PPS1 clearly explains that good design should:

- a) address the connections between people and places by considering the needs of people to access jobs and key services;
- b) be integrated into the existing urban form and the natural and built environments;
- c) be an integrated part of the process for ensuring successful, safe and inclusive villages, towns and cities; and
- d) create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder or fear of crime does not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.

It is not considered that this development proposal is in accordance with the principles of PPS1, in that the scheme does not facilitate and promote sustainable and inclusive patterns of urban development, it does not constitute high quality development through good and inclusive design, and it is not considered that the development would support the existing communities and would not contribute to the creation of safe, sustainable, liveable and mixed communities with good access to jobs and key services for all members of the community. The proposal does not constitute good urban design in that it is inappropriate in its context, does not integrate well into the existing community

and it fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the West Gorton area and the way it would function.

Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (2006)

This guidance strongly encourages the re-use of previously developed vacant or under utilised land and 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. It also provides guidance on issues such as design quality, residential mix and affordable housing. In terms of design quality schemes should create places, streets and spaces which would meet the needs of people, and be visually attractive, safe, and accessible.

PPS3 states that the Government's key housing policy goal is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live. To achieve this, the Government is seeking:

- a) to achieve a wide choice of high quality homes, both affordable and market housing, to address the requirements of the community;
- b) to widen opportunities for home ownership and ensure high quality housing for those who cannot afford market housing, in particular those who are vulnerable or in need;
- c) to improve affordability across the housing market, including by increasing the supply of housing; and
- d) to create sustainable, inclusive, mixed communities in all areas, both urban and rural.

As PPS1 above, PPS3 is also very clear on achieving high quality housing through good design. It explains that good design is fundamental to the development of high quality new housing, which contributes to the creation of sustainable, mixed communities. Development should create places, streets and spaces which meet the needs of people, are visually attractive, safe, accessible, functional, inclusive, have their own distinctive identity and maintain and improve local character. Authorities should also promote designs and layouts, which make efficient and effective use of land, including encouraging innovative approaches to help deliver high quality outcomes.

Therefore, to conclude on design PPS3 clearly outlines that matters to consider when assessing design quality include the extent to which proposed development:

- a) is easily accessible and well-connected to public transport and community facilities and services, and is well laid out so that all space is used efficiently, is safe, accessible and user-friendly;
- b) provides, or enables good access to, community and green and open amenity and recreational space (including play space) as well as private outdoor space such as residential gardens, patios and balconies;

c) is well integrated with, and complements, the neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally in terms of scale, density, layout and access; and

d) take a design-led approach to the provision of car-parking space, that is well integrated with a high quality public realm and streets that are pedestrian, cycle and vehicle friendly.

PPS3 also concentrates on achieving an appropriate mix of housing. It explains that key characteristics of a mixed community are a variety of housing, particularly in terms of tenure and price and a mix of different households such as families with children, single person households and older people. Developers should bring forward proposals for market housing which reflect demand and the profile of households requiring market housing, in order to sustain mixed communities. Proposals for affordable housing should reflect the size and type of affordable housing required. It concludes by stating that it should be ensured that the proposed mix of housing on large strategic sites reflects the proportions of households that require market or affordable housing and achieves a mix of households as well as a mix of tenure and price. The level of housing provision should be determined taking a strategic, evidence-based approach that takes into account relevant local, sub-regional, regional and national policies and strategies.

It is not considered that this development proposal is in accordance with the principles of PPS3, in that the proposal fails to deliver an acceptable level of design quality in terms of creating places, streets and spaces which would meet the needs of people, and be visually attractive, safe, and accessible. It is also considered that the scheme does not achieve an appropriate mix of housing, and would not create a mixed community with a variety of housing, particularly in terms of tenure and price and a mix of different households such as families with children, single person households and older people.

Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management (2005)

The overall objective of Government policy on waste, as set out in the strategy for sustainable development, is to protect human health and the environment by producing less waste and by using it as a resource wherever possible. Through more sustainable waste management, moving the management of waste up the 'waste hierarchy' of reduction, reuse, recycling and composting, using waste as a source of energy, and only disposing as a last resort, the Government aims to break the link between economic growth and the environmental impact of waste. This means a step-change in the way waste is handled and significant new investment in waste management facilities. The planning system is pivotal to the adequate and timely provision of the new facilities that will be needed.

PPS10 states that all planning authorities should, to the extent appropriate to their responsibilities, prepare and deliver planning strategies that:

a) provide a framework in which communities take more responsibility for their own waste, and enable sufficient and timely provision of waste management facilities to meet the needs of their communities; and

b) ensure the design and layout of new development supports sustainable waste management.

PPS10 explains that good design and layout in new development can help to secure opportunities for sustainable waste management, including for kerbside collection and community recycling as well as for larger waste facilities. Planning authorities should ensure that new development makes sufficient provision for waste management and promote designs and layouts that secure the integration of waste management facilities without adverse impact on the street scene or, in less developed areas, the local landscape.

It is not considered that this scheme has provided an adequate strategy for the storage and recycling of refuse, in that the design and layout in this development does not secure adequate opportunities for sustainable waste management and does not secure the integration of waste management facilities without adverse impact on the street scene. Therefore, it is considered that this proposal is contrary to the principles of PPS10.

Planning Policy Guidance Note 13: Transport (2001)

PPG13 highlights that our quality of life depends on transport and easy access to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services. We need a safe, efficient and integrated transport system to support a strong and prosperous economy. But the way we travel and the continued growth in road traffic is damaging our towns, harming our countryside and contributing to global warming.

Land use planning has a key role in delivering the Government's integrated transport strategy. By shaping the pattern of development and influencing the location, scale, density, design and mix of land uses, planning can help to reduce the need to travel, reduce the length of journeys and make it safer and easier for people to access jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking, and cycling. The use of parking policies, alongside other planning and transport measures, should promote sustainable transport choices and reduce reliance on the car for work and other journeys. All new developments should ensure that the needs of disabled people as pedestrians, public transport users and motorists are taken into account in the implementation of planning policies and traffic management schemes, and in the design of individual developments. Developments should consider how best to reduce crime and the fear of crime, and seek by the design and layout of developments and areas, to secure community safety and road safety.

It is considered that this proposal does not accord with the principles of PPG13 as the pattern of development and the location, scale, density, design and mix of land uses, planning does not help to reduce the need to travel, reduce the length of journeys and does not make it safer and easier for people to access jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking, and cycling.

Planning Policy Guidance Note 17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation (2002)

Open spaces, sport and recreation all underpin people's quality of life. Well designed and implemented planning policies for open space, sport and

recreation are therefore fundamental to delivering broader Government objectives. These include supporting an urban renaissance, supporting a rural renewal, promotion of social inclusion and community cohesion, health and well being and promoting more sustainable development.

In the promotion of social inclusion and community cohesion, well planned and maintained open spaces and good quality sports and recreational facilities can play a major part in improving people's sense of well being in the place they live. As a focal point for community activities, they can bring together members of deprived communities and provide opportunities for people for social interaction.

In identifying where to locate new areas of open space, sports and recreational facilities, local authorities should:

a) promote accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport, and ensure that facilities are accessible for people with disabilities;

b) avoid any significant loss of amenity to residents, neighbouring uses or biodiversity;

c) improve the quality of the public realm through good design;

d) carefully consider security and personal safety, especially for children; and

e) assess the impact of new facilities on social inclusion.

Due to the high proportion of poorly integrated, shared public and private spaces, it is not considered that this proposal has delivered social inclusion and community cohesion, well planned and maintained open spaces and good quality sports and recreational facilities that could play a major part in improving the West Gorton area and the residents sense of well being in the place they live.

Relevant Regional Policies

Regional Planning Guidance for the North West RPG13 (2003)

Until the RSS for the North West is formally adopted, RP13 will remain the main policy document for the North West Region. RPG13 outlines that the core areas of the region, Greater Manchester and Merseyside, contain most of the region's disused land and buildings. The positive management and re-use of this huge resource offers considerable scope for the restructuring of land uses in a holistic way to achieve more sustainable patterns of development, higher levels of economic activity and better quality housing, environment and local facilities. The approach towards housing is one that emphasis better quality in both the housing stock and residential environments. The Core Development Principle of RPG13 underpin regional policy and relevant to this development are Policies DP2 and DP3.

Policy DP2 is in relation to enhancing the quality of life. It states that an enhancement in the overall quality of life experienced in the region is required. The overall aim of sustainable development is the provision of a high quality of

life, for this and future generations. Policy DP3 addresses quality in new development and explains that new development must demonstrate good design quality and respect for its setting. Important issues include the integration of new development with the surrounding land use taking into account the landscape character, setting, the quality, distinctiveness and heritage of the environment and the use of sympathetic materials. It also explains that high-quality living and working environments, especially in housing terms, should incorporate community safety and 'designing out crime' measures.

Additional relevant RPG13 policies to this case are UR1 and UR7. Policy UR1 Urban Renaissance highlights the importance of the provision of accessible, desirable, living and working conditions that ensure a good quality of urban life for all. Development should promote urban renaissance by reviving communities, tackling low demand for housing and poor physical conditions. Finally, Policy UR7 focuses on regional housing provision. It states that developments should maximise the re-use of vacant and under-used land and buildings, however they must consider the impact of new housing development upon the existing housing stock in the immediate area and adjoining districts.

It is not considered that this development proposal will enhance the quality of life of existing and future residents, does not constitute good quality design and respect for its setting, and it does not consider the impact of the development on existing housing stock. Therefore, this proposal is considered to be contrary to the principles within RPG13.

Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West (draft)

The Draft North West Plan (The Regional Spatial Strategy) was submitted to Government on 30th January 2006, published for public consultation on 20th March 2006 and closed on 12 June 2006. The Examination in Public commenced in October and the final plan is expected to be published towards the end of 2008. This plan (RSS) will eventually replace Regional Planning Guidance for the North West (RPG 13). The RSS contains many of the themes contained in RPG13 in terms of urban regeneration and the use of previously developed land. The key theme underpinning RSS however is sustainable development.

The document sets out the framework for delivering sustainable development in the North West. The strategy allocated a maximum housing provision of 63,000 for Manchester between 2003 and 2021. Policy MCR2 covers the regional centre and inner areas of the Manchester City Region. This policy states that residential development should be focussed in the inner areas adjacent to the Regional Centre in order to secure a significant increase in their population, to support major regeneration activity including the Manchester Salford Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder, and to secure the improvement of community facilities and the creation of sustainable communities. The emphasis will be on providing a good range of quality housing, in terms of size, type, tenure and affordability, with a high quality environment and accessible local facilities and employment opportunities.

It is considered that this proposal is not in compliance with the principles set out above, as the development does not provide a good range of quality housing, in

terms of size, type, tenure and affordability, with a high quality environment and accessible local facilities and employment opportunities.

Relevant Local Policies

Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995)

The application site is located within Area 8 of the UDP for the City of Manchester. The predominant land use in the area is housing, much of which is modern construction and Council owned. Nevertheless, in many parts of the area, the quality of the environment is poor. There are significant pockets of commercial and industrial activity in the area, particularly in West Gorton, and there are opportunities for further employment generating businesses in the vicinity of Hyde Road and Ardwick Green and alongside the Intermediate Ring Road.

The relevant policies in this case within Area 8 are AB1 and AB4. Policy AB1 states that in deciding its attitudes to proposals within Ardwick, Brunswick and West Gorton the Council will have regard to the general policies in Part 1 of the Plan in order to:-

- a) improve the area as a place to live by seeking to upgrade the housing stock, by the enhancement of communal areas and by improvements designed to make people feel safe in their environment and by promoting improvements to shopping facilities; and
- b) increase the attractiveness of the local environment, particularly around people's homes.

Policy AB4 is specifically in relation to new housing developments. This policy outlines that within the existing housing areas, measures will be taken to improve the quality of the external environment. Priority areas include the Bennett Street estate in West Gorton. This policy aims to improve the quality of life for residents and to improve security. The steps which the Council will take will vary, depending on the precise circumstances. They are designed to complement efforts to improve the quality of the housing stock itself in this area of the City.

When dealing with applications of this nature, regard is given to Development Control Policies No. 7 "New Housing Development" and No. 16 "Street Landscapes". Policy DC7 states that the Council will negotiate with developers to ensure that new housing is accessible at ground floor level to disabled people, including those who use wheelchairs, wherever this is practicable. Policy DC16 can be applied here as this requires the retention of existing trees and the provision of tree planting along the public frontages of sites.

Further housing policies include H1.2, H2.1, H2.2 and H2.7. Policy H1.2 states that the City Council will ensure that the housing stock contains a wide range of housing types to meet the needs of people who want to live in Manchester. The above should include accommodation designed for disabled people. The City Council also encourages environmental improvements to make residential areas safer and more attractive through Policy H2.1. Policy H2.2 is also relevant and states that the Council will not allow development, which will have an

unacceptable impact on residential areas. The matters that the Council will consider will include the scale and appearance of the development and its impact in terms of noise, vibration, traffic generation, road safety and air pollution. Finally, H2.7 outlines how new housing schemes will be expected to be of a high standard of design and to make a positive contribution towards improving the City's environment. Areas of incidental space should not be formed unless arrangements are made for their proper and enduring maintenance.

Policy R1 states that the Council will pursue an area based regeneration strategy working with local communities, public sector and the private and voluntary sectors and Central Government in order to achieve a holistic approach to dealing with economic, social and environmental problems. Policy R1.1 states that the Council will ensure that regeneration programmes maintain and create sustainable communities, and that they improve the quality and range of facilities in the City Centre for all who use it. There is a need to take a holistic area-based approach to regeneration in order to achieve an integrated way of dealing with a wide range of social, economic and environmental issues. The Council is committed to maintaining existing, and creating new, sustainable communities in partnership with all sections of society such as community groups, business and the voluntary sector. An important aspect of the area-based regeneration programmes is the integration of the most deprived communities in Manchester back into the economically successful and vibrant Regional Centre.

There are also Environmental Policies that are relevant in this case. Policy E1 advises that major new development will be required to be located where it can be easily served by public transport. With regards to the City Council's aim to ensure sustainability within developments, Policy E1.2 outlines that in providing for waste disposal the Council will provide convenient facilities for people to dispose of uncollected household/garden waste. These will be of an appropriate standard of design and will not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity. Waste recycling makes good environmental and economic sense. It can conserve natural resources; save energy in production and transport; reduce the risk of pollution; reduce the demand for landfill space for waste material; and enable goods to be produced more cheaply. The provision of convenient facilities for the disposal of household/garden waste reduces the risk of fly tipping. Such facilities, while they need to be convenient, must not be located where they could have a detrimental affect on residential areas.

Policy E3.5 explains that the Council will promote measures, which will lead to a safer environment for all people living in and using the City. These measures will include:-

- a) ensuring that the layout of new development is designed with safety in mind and does not lead to the creation of isolated areas;
- b) designing landscaping schemes so as to minimise the risk of attack;
- c) that community facilities are located where they are easy and safe to get to;
- d) providing safe places for children to play;
- e) improving road safety.

Policy E3.7 outlines that the Council will promote environmental improvements which are aimed at improving conditions for disabled people and people whose mobility and vision is impaired. The Council is committed to improving

conditions for disabled people and people whose mobility and vision is impaired, so that they can enjoy access to the full range of facilities in the City.

Transport policies T2.4 and T3.1 can also be applied to this proposal. Policy T2.4 states that the City Council will expect developments to make adequate provision for their car parking requirements. In deciding whether the level of car parking associated with any development is acceptable, the Council will have regard to the environmental capacity of the site both in terms of the physical appearance of the car parking and its effect on neighbouring activities and also the ability of the local road network to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposed development. Policy T3.1 states that the Council will ensure that the particular needs of both pedestrians and cyclists are catered for in new development schemes.

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance (April 2007)

The Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance was formally adopted in April 2007, and is therefore relevant in this case. Planning Policy Statement 3 'Housing' states that to facilitate efficient delivery of high quality development, Local Planning Authorities should draw on relevant guidance and standards and promote the use of appropriate tools and techniques, such as Design Coding alongside urban design guidelines, detailed masterplans, village design statements, site briefs and community participation techniques. In the City of Manchester, the relevant design tool is the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance.

In relation to character and context, the Guide outlines that design should respect and be informed by location. A high quality environment is created by buildings, which reflect their purpose and respect the place in which they are located. Each new development should be designed having full regard to its context and the character of the area. The Guide advises that design should respect and be informed by location; buildings should front onto streets; buildings should relate well to each other; building height should be carefully considered, and site boundaries and treatment should contribute to the street scene.

Along with the newly introduced requirement to provide a design statement with all planning submissions, the onus is now on the developer to justify their design specifying why a high density development is necessary. The section in the Guide named 'Development should help to sustain local neighbourhoods', states that the layout of the scheme and the design, scale, massing and orientation of its buildings should achieve a unified urban form which blends in with, and links to adjacent areas. Increased development density can be appropriate where it is necessary to reinforce community identity, promote a more economic use of land, increase demand for local facilities and contribute to safer, self-policed streets. However, density levels must be informed by the character of an area and the specific circumstances of a proposal.

In relation to permeability and integration, the Guide states that the street network within new development should contribute to the character of the area. Development proposals should respect and help to reinforce this by providing an appropriate, well designed street network which joins new development with existing, and reinforces links to and through the area. The Guide goes on to clearly indicate that the use of cul-de-sacs is discouraged. Cul-de-sacs impose unnecessary constraints on permeability and can aggravate antisocial behaviour and crime.

Other relevant issues raised within the Guide are crime, refuse and recycling amenity space and car parking. To begin with crime, it outlines that safety and security are vital elements of the urban area and that all new developments will be expected to meet designing out crime principles. The layout of new development should be designed with safety in mind where informal surveillance is promoted, vehicle parking areas are safely designed and crime prevention measures are incorporated. In relation to the provision of refuse and recycling, developers should consider designing facilities for waste storage and recycling from the outset and the size, appearance, location and means of access to waste storage areas should be well integrated into a scheme. Waste storage areas should be of sufficient size to allow for segregated refuse and recycling and should be sensitively located to avoid a detrimental visual impact and poor residential amenity.

In relation to amenity space, the Guide explains that all residents should enjoy usable private amenity space wherever they choose to live in the City. All new developments should be designed to provide on-site amenity space which is fit for purpose and which is informed by, and relates to, the character of the area. This means the provision of gardens that perform well as a multi-functional space. Gardens should provide a safe play area for children, additional storage outside the house, outside drying facilities, space in which to relax, increased amount of planting which enhances the quality of the natural environment, and finally provides space to provide home grown food to the benefit of health and the local community.

Finally, in relation to car parking and the street hierarchy, the Guide outlines that developments should create a cohesive and attractive street network within new developments and ensure that individual buildings relate appropriately to the street frontage. Neighbourhood streets should be designed to encourage local people to walk through the area, and to provide safe and straightforward access to buildings. Buildings should foster enclosure and a sense of place. The street is an important element within a neighbourhood that both looks good and functions well. Car parking should be designed innovatively and imaginatively and it should be sensitively located so that it does not dominate the street scene. It should ideally be provided to the rear, side of, or beneath the building. Parking to the front of a building frequently results in an adverse visual impact and an undesirable setback to the building and the street, and will be discouraged. It concludes by stating that whatever form car parking takes, adequate provision is required for disabled people, elderly people and people with young children.

The Guide also has a specific 'housing density and mix' section which states that the emphasis is on seeking a range and diversity in terms of type and size of new housing to provide a quality range of housing which will enhance the

character of parts of the City, from high density flats, where appropriate, to lower density detached dwellings. It goes on to acknowledge that parts of the City have seen the loss of family housing in favour of flats to such an extent that the character and sustainability of these areas are jeopardised. It is believed that the balance of development in such areas should now revert to the provision of a range of family housing more traditionally characteristic of these parts of the City, which can offer choice to local people and assist the sustainability of these neighbourhoods.

Manchester City Council Interim Policy Residential Developments (2006)

On the 13th September 2006, a report for resolution was approved by the Executive Committee of Manchester City Council in relation to a new approach to the delivery of new housing across the City. The purpose of the report was to set out proposals to manage and shape the housing supply within the City focusing on interim measures in advance of the development of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy. The Executive agreed an interim policy approach to housing for Development Control purposes, based on the Guide to Development 2, Design and Access Statements, existing Regional Spatial Strategy and Unitary Development Plan.

The background to this approach began with a report to Community Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee, in June 2005, on "New housing supply in the City" was the subject of much debate and discussion and resulted in a resolution to Executive. Ward Members across the City were concerned over the size of apartments and the numbers being built outside the City Centre. The City Council has been successful in recent years at resisting inappropriate developments of flats on sites across the city. This has been largely on the basis of protecting the character of neighbourhoods from "overdevelopment" where new development failed to fit in or achieve the quality required. UDP Policy H2.2 and where appropriate H2.7 are used for this approach as it restricts development "which will have an unacceptable impact on residential areas", or is of unacceptable design.

Therefore, the short term response to the issue of managing and shaping the housing supply within the City was related to sending very clear policy signals to the market that the City Council will not support proposals for high density, apartment led developments outside of the City Centre and its fringes unless it can be clearly demonstrated that such development is required on a particular site to achieve the City's aims and objectives. This was considered an essential step recognising increasing evidence of land acquisition at high land values which was resulting in unacceptably high levels of high density flat developments in inappropriate locations which cannot be supported in planning terms. This approach was underpinned using existing UDP Policies H1.2 H2.2 and H2.7 to provide the main policy base, but backed up with the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document. Manchester, therefore, has a very strong case for restricting permissions to developments that best meet its objectives particularly in furthering the regeneration agenda.

New East Manchester Strategic Regeneration Framework (2008)

The objectives of the framework are to create sustainable communities, including developing a range of housing types, promoting high quality urban

design, promoting accessibility and increased demand for homes. The proposed development would contribute to the objectives and aspirations of the framework.

The application site falls within the West Gorton area of the SRF. The Neighbourhood Development Framework for West Gorton states that while formerly a mixed employment residential neighbourhood, changing patterns of employment suggest that the area will gradually emerge as a neighbourhood that is primarily residential. This should be supported through a programme of new housing development, refurbishment of existing stock and selective demolition. The receding employment uses and fragmented land development has resulted in the creation of a number of smaller isolated developments with poor relationships to the wider area. New housing should attempt to bridge these gaps, reconnect areas and extend the street grid pattern where possible to promote greater neighbourhood cohesion. An expanded central green space should provide a focus for this new residential development. The relevant key aims for this area are the creation of new family housing structured on a regular, grid street pattern, the improvement and maintenance of existing open spaces to act as a neighbourhood focus, and the focus of new and refurbished residential development around high quality new open space provision.

Principle

It is considered that the principle of a residential development in this area to aid the comprehensive regeneration of the West Gorton neighbourhood is acceptable. However, the quality of the proposed development, the density, the proposed mix of accommodation, the adequate provision of car parking, amenity space and waste management, and the impact of the development on the character of the area and the surrounding residential properties should be assessed.

Major Development

The proposal has been advertised as a Major Development by virtue of the number of units and the size of the proposed application site.

Environmental Impact Assessment

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 in consultation with relevant consultees and it is considered that the issues that could give rise to significant impact are:

- Effect on Humans
- Population
- Transport
- Noise and Vibration
- Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
- Recreation and Community Facilities
- Utilities and Services
- Telecommunications

- Resources
- Construction Management
- Waste Management
- Hydrology and Flood Risk
- Archaeology
- Effects on Flora, Fauna and Geology
- Ecology
- Ground Conditions
- Effect on Land
- Effect on Air and Climate
- Air Quality
- Daylight and Sunlight
- Wind Assessment.
- Socio-Economic Considerations
- Interaction of Effects and Cumulative Effects

Density/Overdevelopment

The overall density of the development is at 110 dwellings per hectare, between three and twelve storeys in height, which in comparison to the surrounding residential area is very high in number and scale. The level of built form to amenity/landscaped areas provides a very high density that is clearly not keeping with the layout and density of the vicinity. It is felt that the application does not secure an appropriate scale and massing to development in relation to the surrounding area. Therefore, the Head of Planning considers this development to be overdevelopment of the site and unacceptable in relation to density and massing.

The density level results in a very high and unacceptable proportion of flats to family houses, which will be covered in more detail in the section below. Most importantly, the density also results in a number of important factors:

- a) the dwellings being located very close together with low levels of privacy;
- b) creates an unsatisfactory level of private outdoor amenity space for family dwellings and a high proportion of shared amenity space;
- c) it creates an unacceptable strategy for the storage and recycling of refuse in remote waste stations located away from dwellings; and
- d) results in an unacceptable approach to car parking, through a high proportion of parking to the front of buildings, on street parking, parking within undercroft areas or in remote storage locations.

These issues will be addressed in detail in the sections that follow in this report

The impact of this high density, overdeveloped site would be seriously detrimental to the character, context and visual amenity of the neighbourhood and surrounding area, and would not result in the positive and successful regeneration of the West Gorton area.

Mix of Accommodation

The current proposal includes the creation of a 575 residential units with 5.24 hectares of land being developed at a density of 110 dwellings per hectare. The proposed mix for the scheme at the current time is for 60% apartments and only 40% houses at a mix of 23% one bedroom units, 39% two bedroom and 38% three bedroom units. It is considered that the type and size of this

accommodation is purely being driven by the total number of units required on site by the developer. This is not a City Centre or fringe location that necessitates a high density development to support retail and commercial activity. The interim housing policy for Manchester clearly states that the City Council will not support proposals for high density, apartment led developments outside of the City Centre and its fringes, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that such development is required on a particular site to achieve the City's aims and objectives. It is not considered that a high proportion of apartments, particularly in the form of one bedroom apartments, is required on this site nor would it achieve the City's aims and objectives of delivering high quality affordable housing. The high number of one bedroom apartments would also create a transient population to the detriment of creating a sustainable community.

This is a site located within a predominantly medium density residential neighbourhood, which lacks in good quality housing and usable open space. Therefore, the need in this neighbourhood is for larger family houses with good quality private gardens that will significantly improve the general environment and aid in regeneration and the delivery of the West Gorton masterplan. The Head of Planning considers the proposed mix of accommodation put forward in this application as unacceptable and contrary to policy and guidance.

Urban Design/Site Layout

As outlined above, the principle of the redevelopment of this site is welcomed, as this is currently an underused area lacking any urban form or individual buildings of architectural character. However, this is on the basis of a high quality residential redevelopment that will improve the surrounding area and aid in the regeneration of the West Gorton neighbourhood.

It appears in the planning submission that the architects have carried out a number of different options of the site and its relationship to the surrounding area. However, it would appear that the final layout that has been submitted has been exclusively dictated by how much development can be accommodated on the site. It is considered that the site layout is mundane, with little thought given to variation in either open spaces or in height. There is an ordinary sameness about both the layout and the general height of the proposed development and it is considered that the close relationship to the rail viaduct should encourage more variation across the site. There is mainly three storey housing to the east of the site with much larger buildings to the west along the railway line. The mix of urban form and architectural massing could have been dealt with in a variety across the site rather than in concentrations in specific areas. There appears to be a poor architectural relationship between the new development and the existing buildings and structures.

The location of the larger area of public open space in the linear park is also poorly informed. It is considered inappropriate that the open space is located on the periphery of the site rather than being a central and integrated part of the site layout. This would also provide it with natural surveillance in all areas from dwellings rather than being up to the railway.

The layout is set out in lines of terraces, none of which contain meaningful private open space. The scheme also includes a number of cul-de-sacs, which

are actively discouraged by the City Council due to the lack of permeability and the problems created for anti-social behaviour. It is not considered that the design allows for the integration of the new development into the existing estate. There are no permeability access points into existing areas apart from the main access off Bennett Street, and the stepping back of the development along Bennett Street has created a segregation barrier. Within the submission, the architects have carried out an analysis of the site and indicated views in and out of the site and historic or potential access points. Unfortunately, it is not believed this analysis has informed the design of the site layout.

Finally, it is considered that the angled form of Bennett Street at the corner of the application site suggests that this should be handled with a special piece of architecture. This corner has been treated with a multi storage car park with a poor architectural design and fails to achieve the quality of form and design required at this important corner.

Therefore, it is considered that the overall site layout and urban design of this scheme to unacceptable, misinformed, out of character and context with the surrounding area, and contrary to policy and guidance.

Private Amenity Space

In relation to amenity space, it is considered that family houses of up to three bedroom in size should be accompanied by an appropriately sized garden to allow adequate play, relaxing, drying and growing space. In this proposal, each house is only provided with a very small walled garden area, terrace, or a shared decked amenity area or courtyard. It is acknowledged that the scheme does include two small public village greens and a linear park. However, family accommodation should be provided with adequate private space rather than being reliant on shared public spaces. The linear park is also remote in its location alongside the railway viaduct with limited surveillance. Therefore, it is considered that this scheme is unacceptable in relation to the level of amenity space.

Waste Management

The waste management strategy that has been put forward for this scheme includes the provision of remote recycling points. Each house would be provided with an internal segregation area, with a general waste bin and a garden waste bin to be located within the curtilage of the dwelling. However, for the remaining waste and recycling (paper, glass, cans etc), the bins would be located within a 'near entry bring site' positioned within 30 metres walking distance of each house. The apartments would have a central store within each block for the storage of waste and recycling. The relevant departments of the City Council have assessed this approach, and the use of recycling points rather than in curtilage storage does not accord with the City Council's waste guidelines. The remote storage areas do not encourage recycling, as some residents will have to walk up to 30 metres to deposit their waste. If it is more convenient to deposit all rubbish in the general waste bin in the garden, then this may be the preferred option for the occupant. The high density of the development and the small private outdoor amenity areas has dictated the use of recycling points, due to the lack of outside space to store the required number of bins. Therefore, it is believed the waste management strategy for

this development is not satisfactory and is a consequence of an overdevelopment of the site.

Car Parking

As outlined in the description, the strategy for car parking across this site is for one space per residential dwelling with some additional spaces for visitors. This will be provided in the following way: 10% in curtilage to the front of houses, 30% on street parking in 'homezones', 8% in undercroft parking courtyards, 48% in a multi storey parking storage building, and 4% on street parking for visitors. It is considered that this approach is highly inappropriate and detrimental to the visual amenity of the area and would be contrary to policy and guidance.

There are two areas where this strategy is deemed to be unacceptable. These are the high proportion of frontage and on street parking, and the remoteness of the parking for the apartments within the multi storey building. The Design Guide for Manchester clearly states that car parking should be designed innovatively and imaginatively and it should be sensitively located so that it does not dominate the street scene. It should ideally be provided to the rear, side of, or beneath the building. Parking to the front of a building frequently results in an adverse visual impact and an undesirable setback to the building and the street, and will be discouraged. It concludes by stating that whatever form car parking takes, adequate provision is required for disabled people, elderly people and people with young children. This guidance has not been followed in any way across this proposal.

The high proportion of frontage and on street parking will create a detrimental visual impact across the site, with the car clearly dominating the street scene rather than the new buildings and landscaping. If the density across the scheme was lower and the number of apartments was decreased and replaced by more family houses, it would be possible for cars to be parked securely within the curtilage of the new dwellings in an attractive way. The new buildings would then dominate the street, along with street trees, landscaping and quality public realm furniture. This would then create a pleasant and attractive space for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles to move around in safely.

The car parking proposals for the apartments in the scheme is again driven by the unacceptably high density. The twelve storey tower block of apartments located to the rear of the site would be served by the 5 storey car parking storage building, which is located to the front of the site on Bennett Street. This would mean a walk of approximately 500 metres or more through the linear park from the car park to the apartments. It is considered that this approach is not only unrealistic, but it also raises serious concerns over safety. If the owner of the car has shopping, small children or is arriving home late at night, it is highly unlikely that the car park storage would be used. This would lead to further unacceptable and possibly illegal parking on street nearer to the apartment blocks and conflicts between residents for parking spaces. This is also a highly inappropriate approach for disabled users, who potentially would have to travel a significant distance from their parking space to their home.

Therefore, it is considered that the car parking strategy for this scheme to be inappropriate, unacceptable and detrimental to the area, and would be contrary to policy and guidance.

Crime and Disorder

The Crime Impact Statement that has been prepared for this site clearly indicates that there are serious issues of crime and disorder in this area. In the last twelve months, there have been 620 incidents of crime within a 1000 metre square grid of the application site. The Vulnerable Localities Index for this area is also above the average for Manchester.

As shown in the consultation responses highlighted earlier in this report, there is a very strong objection to this proposal from Greater Manchester Police. The first issue is that the Crime Impact Statement was not fully completed, with Part B Recommendations not being requested by the applicants. However, the second and most important issue is that the Police believe that the high density levels and insecure parking arrangements proposed for this development will exacerbate the crime and disorder problems in this area. There are 35 points made by the Architectural Liaison Officer against this proposal and it has been clearly confirmed that the development would not achieve the Secured by Design accreditation. The Design Guide for Manchester outlines that safety and security are vital elements of the urban area and that all new developments will be expected to meet designing out crime principles. The layout of new development should be designed with safety in mind. Again, this issue has ultimately been the result of the overdevelopment of the site.

This is a serious concern as the West Gorton Masterplan seeks to transform the area with a significant uplift in the environment, however the approach being proposed is not consistent with this. Therefore, it is considered that the scheme is clearly unsatisfactory in terms of crime and disorder. It is also not acceptable that the development would not achieve the Secured by Design award.

Residential Amenity

It is acknowledged that the current businesses that are located on this site are 'bad neighbour' uses that have caused problems with noise, dust and heavy vehicle traffic. It is also acknowledged that the principle of a residential development on this site, which is surrounded by existing residential properties, is considered to be acceptable. However, as outlined in PPS1 good planning ensures that we get the right development, in the right place and at the right time. But poor planning can result in a legacy for current and future generations of run-down town centres, unsafe and dilapidated housing, and crime and disorder. It is considered that the proposal that is the subject of this planning application has a poor relationship to the existing residential properties in this area to the detriment of amenity.

The existing properties along Bennett Street, Hayfield Close, Anthony Close and Ercall Avenue are all two storey in height, whereas the new proposals are between three storeys and five storeys in height adjacent to these existing dwellings. The multi storage parking building is five storeys and is located at the back of pavement along Bennett Street immediately opposite these two storey houses. This would have an unacceptable overbearing and

overshadowing impact to the detriment of visual and residential amenity. The close proximity of the new buildings to the existing houses will also create issues of overlooking and a loss of privacy. It is possible that the development will also bring an increased level of criminal activity to the area to the detriment of the future and current inhabitants of this neighbourhood. This development proposal has not considered the impact on the existing residential properties in the area and has not attempted to integrate into the existing community.

Affordability

The issue of affordability in this scheme is a little confused. The section on Affordable Housing within the Planning Statement of the submission opens by stating that there are no policies within the adopted UDP requiring the provision of affordable housing. It then states that the relevant planning guidance for Manchester in relation to affordability is the 'Housing for Choice' document, which does not form part of the development plan and has not been adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document and therefore, could not be given any weight in this instance. The statement then goes through the exception criteria and that this development fulfils a number of these including the high proportion of socially rented properties already in the area and that the applicant entered into a legally binding contract with the site owner in August 2007.

However, the final paragraph of the affordable housing section then states that the applicant proposes that all of the residential units will be made available for sale for owner occupation and is currently investigating, in conjunction with New East Manchester and King Sturge, potential financial models which will create pathways to home ownership. It claims that further information could be provided and could be secured through a S106. Although this issue has not been included in the reasons for refusal as further information could be collected, it was considered to be an important issue in this case that the Committee Members should be made aware of. It is considered that this is an important location for the provision of affordable homes and that more work could be done and information submitted for consideration on this matter.

Design for Access 2

This is not a City Council owned site, however it is considered that more effort could have been made to comply with the Design for Access 2 requirements. Out of the 575 units of accommodation proposed, only 470 units would be accessible to visitors and 230 fully adaptable for disabled users. As above, the high density of the development again drives this across the site and the small floor plans of the houses and apartments. Although it is believed that this issue alone does not warrant the refusal of this application, it was considered to be an important issue in this case that the Committee should be made aware of. It is believed that with a lower density scheme and a higher proportion of larger family houses, a greater level of accessibility could be achieved.

Sustainability

It has been confirmed within the application material, that the development has due regard to the sustainability agenda. The detailed design of the proposed houses and apartments has included the compliance with Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, a CO2 emission of at least 25% lower than Part L of

Building Regulations, and the properties will include one car parking space and secure cycle storage.

Conclusion

The redevelopment of this site has the potential to deliver major environmental and regeneration benefits to West Gorton and this residential area of Manchester. However, the proposal put forward in this planning application constitutes overdevelopment, provides an unacceptable mix of accommodation, has an unacceptable layout and urban design, would have a detrimental impact on the visual and residential amenity of the surrounding area and its occupants, proposes an unsatisfactory car parking strategy to the detriment of highway safety and visual amenity and would result in serious problems in relation to crime and disorder in an area that already experiences high levels of criminal activity and anti-social behaviour.

Therefore, the Head of Planning considers this scheme to be unacceptable and contrary to National, Regional and Local policies and guidance.

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 a 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 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 refusal of the application is proportionate to the wider benefits of refusal and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and country Planning Acts.

Recommendation

The Head of Planning therefore recommends that the Committee **REFUSE** planning application **085708/FO/2008/N2** for all the reasons outlined above in this report.

Conditions and/or Reasons:

1) Having regard to the character and density of the development, the number and type of residential units, and the development's failure to make adequate provision for private outdoor amenity space, in curtilage car parking provision, satisfactory refuse storage, and the position and inappropriate spacing between adjoining properties, the proposal would constitute overdevelopment of the site. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the context, character, urban form and visual amenity of the area, the residential amenities of the future

occupiers of the site and the existing occupiers of the surrounding residential accommodation, contrary to Policies AB1, AB4, DC7, H1.2, H2.1, H2.2, H2.7, R1, E1.2, E3.5, E3.7 and T2.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, the Interim Policy Approach (Housing Development Pipeline: Planning Response), and the guidance contained within the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Guidance, New East Manchester Strategic Regeneration Framework, Planning Policy Statement 1, Planning Policy Statement 3, Planning Policy Statement 10, Planning Policy Guidance Note 17, Regional Planning Guidance for the North West, in particular Policies DP2, DP3, UR1 and UR7, and the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy Policy MCR2.

2) The creation of 345 apartments across this scheme would fail to provide an appropriate mix of housing types in this locality and would add to an oversupply of apartments in the area, which would have a detrimental impact upon the character and quality of the local residential environment and fail to fulfil the objectives of a sustainable and attractive community, contrary to policies AB1, AB4, R1, H1.2 and H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester City Council, the Interim Policy Approach (Housing Development Pipeline: Planning Response), and the guidance contained within the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Guidance, New East Manchester Strategic Regeneration Framework, Planning Policy Statement 1 and Planning Policy Statement 3.

3) The proposed development by reason of its siting, scale, massing and relationship to surrounding existing residential properties would form an overdominant and intrusive feature within the street scene and would result in an unacceptable detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the surrounding occupiers with respect to overlooking and an overbearing feature, contrary to Policies H2.1, H2.2, H2.7, R1, E3.5 and E3.7 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and the guidance contained within the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Guidance, New East Manchester Strategic Regeneration Framework, Planning Policy Statement 1, Planning Policy Statement 3, Regional Planning Guidance for the North West, in particular Policies DP2, DP3, UR1 and UR7.

4) The proposed development, by reason of its high density, urban design, built form, poor layout, lack of integration and variation, the creation of cul-de-sacs, the dominance of car parking and a lack of meaningful and integrated open space, has an inappropriate form of design that has not been informed by the character and context of the surrounding area, has an inappropriate relationship to neighbouring buildings and structures and will result in a detrimental impact upon the street scene, visual amenity, character and the successful regeneration of the neighbourhood and area, contrary to Policies AB1, AB4, H2.1, H2.2, H2.7, R1, E3.5 and E3.7 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and the guidance contained within the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Guidance, New East Manchester Strategic Regeneration Framework, Planning Policy Statement 1, Planning Policy Statement 3, Planning Policy Guidance Note 17, Regional Planning Guidance for the North West, in particular Policies DP2, DP3, UR1 and UR7, and the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy Policy MCR2.

5) The proposal would compromise highway and pedestrian safety by virtue of the unacceptable provision of on-street car parking and remote car parking in multi storage areas, the unsatisfactory width of carriageways, manoeuvrability and servicing, and the lack of adequate provision of parking for disabled users and potential users of the proposed retail units, which would lead to unacceptable conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles to the detriment of highway safety and to the detriment of the visual amenity of the new development and of the local area, contrary to Policies H2.1, H2.2, H2.7, E3.5 and T2.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and the guidance contained within the Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Guidance, Planning Policy Statement 1 , Planning Policy Statement 3 and Planning Policy Guidance Note 13.

6) The proposed development would create significant problems in relation to the risk of crime and disorder and would fail to pay appropriate regard to the security of its occupiers and users by virtue of its layout and detailed design, fostering the risk of crime to the detriment of the quality of the built environment and the sustainability of the community, contrary to Policies E3.5 and H2.2 of the unitary development Plan for the City of Manchester; contrary to 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; contrary to promoting the well-being of the area in pursuance of the Council's powers under section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000, and contrary to the guidance contained in PPS1 "Delivering Sustainable Development".

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: 085708/FO/2008/N2 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.

HEAD OF PLANNING