

Comments for Planning Application 142986/VO/2025

Application Summary

Application Number: 142986/VO/2025

Address: Field Of Os South Of Claridge Road Manchester

Proposal: City Council Development - Erection of modular-building, including associated landscaping to provide a flexible space for youth and community activities (Class F.2)

Case Officer: Steven McCoombe

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Dear Officer,

As a resident of Fielden Avenue, I am pleased to see proposals to enhance the Field of Os through construction of new facilities, particularly if this offers a direct benefit to Oswald Road primary school and allows the children there to make the most of the field. However, I feel that for the development to realise its full potential, the current proposals need to be revisited. My concerns are discussed below:

1. The size of the new development is too big. Within our ward, there is very little open green space for residents. The field of Os serves as a very popular location for residents to exercise their dogs and generally enjoy green space. The proposed works will take up nearly half of the field, yet the net usable space of the building is relatively small. Whilst I am supportive of introducing facilities on the field, the land take associated with the current scheme is too large compared with the benefit it offers. Part of the external works includes access for disabled parking - Is this really necessary? There is ample parking capacity on Claridge road where disabled parking bays could easily be marked on as opposed to taking space from the existing field. From the documents submitted for planning, I see no consideration to how the remaining field area could be sub divided into sports pitches - the area appears to have been notionally divided to suit the alignment of Fielden avenue rather than a more considered approach which seeks to minimise the impact on the field area / maximise the usage potential of the field for the primary school. I think that the benefits that the proposed scheme offers could easily be achieved with a smaller footprint of hardstanding.
2. The Flood Risk Assessment discusses how SUDS features 'could' be implemented on the scheme, but from review of the architect's plans, none have actually been incorporated. I would

expect these features to be specified at an early stage - green roof or blue roof systems could be adopted quite readily, or use of permeable paving or systems such as grasscrete which would be more sympathetic to the current site. We expect that this would be conditioned in line with the NPPF requirements for SUDS.

3. The Design & Access statement references a requirement for offsite works to address the BNG requirements. I would expect there to be more effort made within the proposals to address BNG requirements, rather than simply stating that this would need to be addressed elsewhere. As described above, this is one of few green spaces in the area so every effort should be made to minimise impacts on greenery / ecology in the immediate vicinity.

4. The proposals for pedestrian access from Oswald Lane are not feasible without removal of a mature, beautiful tree. This sits directly in front of the proposed gate location - the position of the tree shown on the architect's plan is not reflective of the actual tree location. This needs revisiting. We note no arboricultural reports have been submitted as part of the planning application so perhaps specialist input should be sought on this matter.

5. We understand the Field of Os is owned by the Oswald Road primary school - the natural access route from the primary school into the new centre would therefore be from Fielden avenue, via the existing gated entrance. The arrangement of the proposed works should therefore be orientated more towards this access point, and indeed towards the field as a whole. The frontage of the building is currently facing the eastern boundary wall rather than towards the field - the relationship between the building and the context of it's surroundings is not favourable. The 'back of house' area of the building is to the western elevation and so the building will no doubt be unsightly when viewed from the field. I feel this relationship between the proposed building and the field could be improved dramatically, particularly if vehicle access into the development is omitted.

6. As the building will be accessed through the existing fencing along the north and south elevations of the field, additional consideration should be given to the remainder of the existing boundary treatment - i.e. as part of the proposed works, could new fencing be provided to the perimeter of the whole field? This will not only offer improvements to the whole area from an aesthetical standpoint, but also offers increased degree of security for the proposed centre as the current fencing is in disrepair and can be easily accessed through torn holes. This echoes my desire for the new development to be more sympathetic to it's context / surroundings.

7. The planning statement states that the 'Friends of Field of Os', who have been instrumental in the redevelopment and maintenance of the adjacent pocket park, are in support of the proposals. I know firsthand that this is not the case and that they haven't been consulted. As they are so intrinsically involved in the maintenance and improvements of the field and adjacent park (on a voluntary basis!), we strongly believe they should be consulted regarding the works and their input subsequently reflected in the plans.

8. I feel the usage of the rooms within the building is confused - why are so many meeting rooms required? Priority should be given towards creation of facilities that benefit usage of the field - meeting rooms does not achieve this. Perhaps additional storage or changing facilities should be incorporated? Input should be sought from the primary school on what facilities would benefit them.

There is clear potential for this development to have a positive impact on the area, both to it's immediate context and to the local community. I believe that the changes described above can be readily accommodated and believe these will also result in a cheaper build cost than what is currently proposed.