

Comments for Planning Application 143413/FO/2025

Application Summary

Application Number: 143413/FO/2025

Address: Land Bound By Longford Road, Peveril Crescent, Rye Bank Road And Longford Park (commonly Referred To As Ryebank Fields) Manchester M21 9WW

Proposal: Change of use of former university playing fields to community woodland and meadow.

Case Officer: Robert Griffin

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: No meaningful consultation was undertaken to support this application. Rather, an entirely closed exercise was undertaken, focussed solely on the NIMBY group opposing the alternative application for this site and those immediately neighbouring the site. No attempt to publicise either of the so-called 'public' consultation events was made in any local publication or social media. Indeed, the applicants own social media profiles are carefully guarded and anyone with opposing views is summarily blocked from engaging with them or even seeing their misleading outputs.

This innately biased consultation is simply not adequate for a proposal of this nature (i.e. that seeks to deny housing opportunity to 120 households). Indeed, it is highly questionable whether the application should've been validated at all given the complete absence of meaningful or appropriate public consultation.

The same applicant group managed to leaflet drop the whole of Chorlton encouraging them to object to the alternative application so it's not clear why they could not do the same to notify people of their own plans to exacerbate homelessness. The applicant should be required to undertake meaningful consultation beyond members of their own group prior to the determination of this application.

The application is not supported by an appropriate assessment of ground conditions and associated risks, nor a remediation strategy setting out how the application proposes to make the site safe for the intensified use it proposes. The historic uses of the site included use as a landfill site for dumping unregulated waste. This is known to contain asbestos and other toxins that present significant risks to both human health and that of the wildlife the applicant group pretend to

be seeking to protect.

More use of the site will mean more erosion of the thin layer of topsoil that covers the unregulated landfill beneath. More people spending more time on the site also significantly increases exposure to the risks presented by the ground conditions. No consideration or mitigation of these significant risks is included in the application materials and is needed prior to any determination of this application.

The Planning Statement refers to a report on geotechnical and environmental constraints that seems to have now been deleted from the portal. Clearly, a detailed assessment based on an extensive intrusive ground investigations is required to accompany any application of this nature and the application should not be determined in the absence of such.

With the benefit of the detailed ground investigation findings, the application should also be supported by a detailed and robust remediation strategy. This must reflect the fact that the application seeks to significantly intensify the recreational use of the site and the inherent risks this would raise for human health, including asbestos poisoning.

It must set out what works are required to make all areas of the site safe for the proposed intensified recreational use of the site. It should also set out how the application proposes to fund and deliver the requisite remediation prior to approval/implementation. A Grampian condition requiring the implementation in full of a the remediation strategy is required if this application to be approved. The applicant group must have a legal requirement to remediate the site in full and accept full legal liability for any injury and illness caused by use of the site in line with their proposal.

I wish to be notified of any future consultation events (required to address the material shortcomings in the previous, closed exercise) as well as the submission of any additional information to address the significant gaps in the information necessary to determine this application and will comment further at that time.

Notwithstanding the above very serious failings in the application, i also wish to object to the principle of the application. Maintaining the current use of the site as a wasteland is hugely inappropriate in the context of the acute housing crisis the city and the country is facing. It is unconscionable that some selfish people are so keen to retain the current view of the wasteland from their bedroom windows that they would rather see 120 households deprived of housing. Frankly, i have no idea how they look at themselves in the mirror.

Whether directly as a result of the non-provision of affordable housing or indirectly as shortages in market housing exacerbate the need for social and affordable housing, this proposal will make a very bad housing crisis even worse, if it were approved/implemented.

As of June 2025, there were over 15,000 households on Manchester's housing waiting lists, with those seeking 1 bed accommodation typically waiting in excess of 3.5 years in often unsuitable and unfit emergency accommodation. These horrific facts should be a material consideration in the determination of this spurious application which, in effect, is only seeking to prevent the excellent alternative application for this site that would contribute significantly to addressing local affordable, specialist and market housing needs.