

Comments for Planning Application 143445/FO/2025

Application Summary

Application Number: 143445/FO/2025

Address: British Muslim Heritage Centre College Road Manchester M16 8BP

Proposal: Extension of time for further three years for a temporary marquee

Case Officer: Sue Wills

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Re: Application 143445/FO/2025 - British Muslim Heritage Centre, College Road, Manchester M16 8BP

Proposal: Extension of time for further three years for a temporary marquee

Dear Madam,

I am a neighbour of the BMHC who is gravely concerned about the above application. For the reasons set out below, I submit that the application should be refused.

1. Principle of Development and Repeated Temporary Consents

Temporary consents are intended as an exception, not a permanent arrangement.

The marquee was first permitted in 2013 as a short-term measure, and has since been renewed in 2016, 2019, and 2022.

To grant yet another three-year extension would amount to permanent development by stealth, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and established planning principles.

The continued renewal undermines the Council's ability to require a properly designed, permanent solution that respects the heritage significance of the Grade II* listed building.

2. Heritage and Conservation Area Harm

The site is within the Whalley Range Conservation Area and the main building is Grade II* listed,

one of the highest levels of protection under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Even "less than substantial harm" (NPPF §212) must be given great weight and only outweighed where public benefits clearly justify it.

The marquee is a large, incongruous, and visually intrusive structure that undermines the setting of the listed building and erodes the character of the conservation area.

The applicants have had over a decade to progress a permanent, sympathetic replacement; failure to do so cannot justify continued harm.

This harm "should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use" (NPPF §215). As outlined below, the current use of the marquee is far from being optimally viable.

3. Residential Amenity and Noise

The marquee has been the subject of repeated complaints from residents concerning noise, disturbance, and anti-social behaviour linked to events.

Soundproofing measures and noise limiters have not prevented noise breakout, particularly fireworks, cars traffic, low-frequency music and crowd noise, which materially harms neighbours' living conditions.

Late-night events and dispersal of large numbers of guests cause unacceptable disturbance in what is a predominantly residential area.

Our house is only 16 metres away from the road where the guests set off smoke flares. The smoke prevents my family, in particular, my small child, from using our garden. We have had to close down all windows and doors and reclude ourselves indoors to avoid the smoke for the duration of events. When asked to take action, the security personnel of the marquee have ignored us or shrugged their shoulders.

Granting further permission would perpetuate ongoing and foreseeable harm contrary to Core Strategy Policy DM1 (residential amenity).

4. Traffic, Parking and Highway Safety

Despite the Travel Plan, in practice events regularly generate significant parking overspill onto surrounding residential streets, causing congestion, obstruction of driveways, and risk to highway

safety. This affects not only College Road, but also Burford Road, where the guests of events at the marquee often park their vehicles. Burford Road is a one-way street, so excessive parking can completely block traffic for several neighbours.

There is inadequate enforcement of travel plan measures. Reliance on voluntary compliance is insufficient to mitigate the scale of the problem.

The cumulative effect is demonstrably harmful and contrary to Core Strategy Policies T2 and DM1.

5. Management Failures and Breach of Conditions

Residents report repeated non-compliance with previous planning conditions, including:

- * Events operating beyond permitted hours.
- * Inadequate control of guests outside the marquee.
- * Failure to prevent litter, noise and smoke during the event and on dispersal.

Revised management strategies (2025) are aspirational but lack robust enforcement. Past performance is a reliable indicator of future behaviour. Many attendees to the events are visitors from outside the area. Therefore, penalties or bans after breach of conditions are not effective measures and possibly impossible to enforce in practice.

Planning case law confirms that where conditions cannot be effectively enforced, permission should not be granted.

6. Public Benefits Do Not Outweigh Harm

The applicant relies on income generation to maintain the listed building. However:

- * This is a private financial benefit, not a public one in planning terms.
- * Public benefits must be specific, deliverable, and substantial. Reliance on temporary marquee income for maintenance after twelve years is unsustainable.
- * The argument that "without the marquee the building cannot be maintained" is unsubstantiated and cannot override statutory heritage protections.
- * No financial study has been provided to support the reasoning that an appropriate and efficient use of the building could not generate sufficient income for maintain the listed building.

* The building itself was not designed for holding large events with loud music, fireworks, and smoke flares. The marquee circumvents this fact by enabling an use that is not appropriate for this building and the surrounding area.

7. Legitimate Expectation of a Permanent Solution

Previous approvals were explicitly temporary, with the expectation of a permanent redevelopment.

Granting further extensions creates a legitimate expectation among residents that the Council is unwilling to enforce its own conditions or policy aims.

A refusal now would be consistent with earlier decisions and would incentivise the applicant to bring forward the promised permanent scheme.

8. Planning Balance

The proposal causes clear, ongoing harm to:

* Heritage significance (listed building setting and conservation area).

* Residential amenity (noise, disturbance, air-pollution from vehicles and smoke flares, and late-night activity).

* Highway safety and parking.

These harms are substantial, long-standing, and well-documented.

Any claimed public benefits are limited, speculative, and do not outweigh the harm.

The measures proposed in the present application to address the harm are not credible at this point after many years of ongoing harm.

Conclusion

The Council is respectfully urged to refuse this application. To grant yet another temporary consent would:

* Perpetuate significant and foreseeable harm to neighbours.

* Undermine the heritage protections enshrined in law.

* Allow temporary consents to become permanent by default, contrary to planning principle.

A refusal would not prevent the applicant from bringing forward a permanent, well-designed, and policy-compliant scheme. It would, however, protect the residential community and uphold the statutory duty to conserve heritage assets.

Yours faithfully,