

Comments for Planning Application 142311/FO/2025

Application Summary

Application Number: 142311/FO/2025

Address: Land At The Former Burnage Cricket Mauldeth Road Manchester

Proposal: Erection of up to 66 no. dwellings (53 no. dwellinghouses and 13 no. apartments - Class C3) with associated access, car parking, infrastructure and landscaping|cr||cr|

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: Planning Application 142311/FO/2025 - Former Burnage Cricket Club

The objections to the Planning Application are in two parts. Firstly, objections to the proposed housing scheme and secondly to the proposal for the cricket wickets at Cringle Fields.

1/ I object that the applicant has only agreed to meet the 20% requirement for social housing by offering flats. I feel this is no contribution to local housing needs or for homeless families. This is unacceptable. If the application is to be approved, the social housing contribution should be a proportion of the planned houses in order to effectively contribute to reducing the housing need in Burnage and Manchester.

2/ I object to the size, layout and density of the project given the local context including population, public services and road networks.

Firstly, the intention to build 46 four bed room houses plus a further 13 one bed apartments and 7 three bedroom houses on a former, not full size cricket club field, is unacceptable. This level of housing will lead to a high density which is overpowering on such a small site. I also object that the proposed housing does not reflect the houses within the area.

In its Design and Access Statement the applicant states:

"the scheme aims to provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes, including apartments as well as 3 and 4 bed houses, to enhance the diversity of the homes on offer in Burnage"

I object that the scheme cannot be said to offer an "appropriate mix of dwellings". It offers a scheme which is dominated by 4 bed houses. I agree there is a need for 4 bed accommodation but not in such density. It would have been preferable to have a balanced mix of houses. An increase in 3 bed houses and in one bedroom apartments would allow the site to be more spacious and less dense in regard to layout and residents. The recent application for new dwellings on the B&M store (Planning Application 141306/FO/2024) highlights a different more balanced density than the proposed development on Burnage Cricket ground. It offers 2 bed houses, 41 apartments, 8 three bed houses and 12 four bed houses. In its Public Consultation leaflet, for example, it states: "The scheme aims to provide a genuine (rather than an inappropriate as above) mix of accommodation options for all ages and household sizes". This accords with Manchester's Places for Everyone policy. I object that the proposed scheme is not an appropriate or balanced mix of dwellings in line with this policy and as a result will have negative consequences for the area and therefore should be refused and amended accordingly.

3/ I object to the application as it does not contain an assessment for Daylight and Sunlight and details of the elevations between the proposed housing and the existing houses it will face.

The perimeter houses in the scheme are made up single blocks of 4 Houses. The houses facing them are semi-detached and without these pieces of information, comments on the situation can only be made hypothetically. There is, in particular, what level of sunlight is available in gardens. There is also no information on this issue as regards those houses in the internal section of the proposal which overlook each other. Research has shown that sunlight/daylight is essential for healthy living and decreases costs for lighting etc. With the large number of children likely to be living on the site, the gardens of the Houses would be a particularly important for them to use. On requesting details of the sizes of the gardens for the properties, I was advised to view the Proposed Site Plan on the documents listed for the application. This, however, does not give these details of the garden sizes in the proposed development.

See:

https://pa.manchester.gov.uk/online-applications/files/DCAA1FE1605039EC9F5C7C9CBFD75D66/pdf/142311_FO_2025-PROPOSED_SITE_PLAN-2662192.pdf

As the site will not have a play area for the large number of children that can be accommodated and the only such provision is across Kingsway in Ladybarn Park. To access these children and their families on the site would have to cross a constantly busy four lane thoroughfare with a forty mile an hour speed limit. Children would need adult supervision to safely cross Kingsway. The difficulties of this access to play facilities highlights the importance of gardens for play space. The provision of bike sheds in the gardens will reduce the space available for children and their families. As there is no daylight/sunlight assessment for the site and especially, for example, to its gardens and to the houses next to the bordering the development.

4/ I object to the size of the of the 4 bed houses been close to minimum considering the numbers of houses proposed for the site and the density/size of the blocks to accommodate them makes these minimum standards unacceptable.

The scale of the houses, in particular the 4 bedroom houses is close to minimum standards. The percentage over the standard for the majority of 4 bed houses ranges from 4.4% to 4.6% and for two other blocks 5.6% to 5.8%. This is unacceptable.

See:

https://pa.manchester.gov.uk/online-applications/files/C0840456BF1349F63EF68F8C33D88794/pdf/142311_FO_2025-AREA_SCHEDULE-2662143.pdf

5/ I object to the Planning Application as it does not take into account the impact of the additional approved construction of a new development on the site of the current B&M Store on Kingsway (141306/FO/2024). Its preparation work for the planning application should have been delayed until after the approval given to B&M Store development. It thereby ignores this in the documents presented to Manchester Council. With two construction sites in very close proximity on the air quality, local traffic flows etc. The nursery on the corner of Kingsway and Mauldeth would be vulnerable to construction dust/traffic etc and Mauldeth Rd school is also likely to suffer these as well. There are also residents to consider, both in terms of the noise, dust and debris and general inconvenience of potentially having two operational building sites in very close proximity.

5/ I object to the application on the grounds that the Air Quality Assessment does not take into account the consequences of the two developments' demolition and construction and other phases of the developments being simultaneously conducted.

6/ I object to the application because local resources - in particular health (both primary care and dental care) and education are not available for the occupants of the two schemes - B&M Store and Burnage Cricket Club.

For the children and their adult carers, they will be part of considerable demands on local services including for example, the availability of nursery and school places, the ability to register with a GP and a dentist etc. The two schemes will be in competition for these essential services which are not currently sufficient for the population that is already resident in the area. Furthermore, if places are not available, those services currently used by the families will have to be maintained. Thereby causing additional costs such as transport, more likely by car, to these resources and environmental costs from additional traffic and pollution.

The application proposes 7 three bed Houses and 46 four bed Houses. These properties could accommodate 152 children if you allow for one child per bedroom. If you add in the 3 and 4 bed houses on the same basis that are proposed on the B&M store scheme this means a further 52

children which totals 190 children. I have not added children who might be present in the number of 2 bed apartments on the B&M development. For the children and their adult carers, they will be part of considerable demands from the 2 schemes on local services including for example, the availability of school places, the ability to register with a GP and a dentist etc.

These issues are the responsibility of Manchester Council and the ensuing Planning Officer's report should contain an assessment of the probabilities of the new residents gaining access to these essential services in the local area.

The provision of the 12 four bed houses etc at the B&M site are not taken into account in this Planning Application as regards the "appropriate mix of accommodation" it provides. Overall, there will be 58 4 bed houses for sale or rent in close proximity and those at Burnage Ground will be a very unusual grouping of 4 bed houses in a small area. This is not considered in the application and I wish to object to the proposed development as a result.

"According to the 2019 Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), Manchester ranks 6 out of 326 local authorities in England, where 1 is the most deprived".

The proposed scheme, plus the B&M store development, will not ease the need for affordable housing in Manchester. The B&M scheme because the rents and associated charges will be unaffordable for those on low incomes. The Burnage Cricket Club scheme's proposed houses will be on sale on the open market at a price beyond the means of low income Burnage residents needing affordable housing and to those wishing to move on from homeless and temporary accommodation.

7/ I object to the Application, as so many 4 bed houses are available at Burnage Cricket Ground, they could be purchased to become Houses of Multiple Occupation HMOs. An "appropriate" mix of the different types of housing on the site would reduce the likelihood of HMOs.

With such a high number of 4 bed houses, including the 12 at the B&M store, to buy especially or rent, there is the real possibility of them being purchased or rented to allow them to be rented out as HMOs. The Burnage Cricket Ground development is at greater risk of this occurring. Whilst there are a range of Council rules, HMOs can cause problems for other households such as noise and disturbance, car parking issues and overview of other properties. There are also issues for landlords over time.

8/ I object that the size, design and layout of the development fails to give information on the planned design which would indicate that the houses planned and the layout of the site are unprecedented.

Having recently had a number of planning applications in the area, the documents have usually included information and photographs of comparable finished developments. This acts as a means

of support for their proposals. This does not appear in this development. I have attempted to discover an estate with equivalent levels of 4 bed provision on a similar site which I have failed to do. I also looked at 4 bedroom houses for sale in Manchester which are comparable to the proposed 4 house blocks. I also have failed to do so. The vast majority of 4 bed houses for sale were semi-detached or larger older houses which were semi-detached or in a row with more width and space available to the properties. I would have expected information detailing examples of this design and layout in other locations. The failure to provide such examples leads me again to object to the scheme.

9/ I wish to object to the positioning of the 2 properties described below and the failure of the Traffic assessment to consider traffic from the Kingsway junction towards Burnage as this would have given a more accurate picture of the traffic using Mauldeth Rd.

"As shown on the proposed site layout at Appendix B, access to 64 of the proposed 66 dwellings on the site would be provided via a new simple priority junction arrangement off Mauldeth Road. The remaining 2 dwellings would be served by direct private driveways off Mauldeth Road".

See:

https://pa.manchester.gov.uk/online-applications/files/3BB55E7F11DE4C8E95F5DC45E7CDB484/pdf/142311_FO_2025-ACCESS_PLAN-2662189.pdf

The properties are too close to the corner of Kingsway/ Mauldeth Rd junction - see diagram below. The vision available from that position to exit directly onto Mauldeth Rd is poor. That view is obstructed by the carpet business, the vehicles parked in the carpet's business parking area including cars, vans and larger vehicles delivering carpets. The users of these parking spaces would also be subject to traffic emerging from Mauldeth Rd opposite and from vehicles turning left from Kingsway up Mauldeth Rd. A right turn onto Mauldeth Rd from the spaces would be difficult and potentially dangerous from the spaces.

Furthermore, the diagram does not show the right turn into Broadhill Rd which will further complicated exiting from these driveways. This is in regular use for vehicles to access the shops/businesses opposite the development, the nursery on Broadhill Rd and access to Broadlea Rd and the sizeable estate of housing between Broadhill Rd and Green End Road. This junction slows down traffic both going up to Burnage Lane and through the Mauldeth Rd/Kingsway junction. It slows down the traffic on Mauldeth Rd as there is no yellow box to for access through the queue to access Brookfield Rd. This holds up traffic heading to Burnage Lane. This junction at Brookfield Rd is not considered in the Transport Assessment and its inclusion in the traffic survey would have led to a larger count of vehicles using Mauldeth Rd/Kingsway junction than the Transport Assessment reported.

The worst scenario is if the cars from these driveways reverse onto the main road. This is the likely means to park in order to avoid attempting a reverse manoeuvre on Mauldeth Rd. The poor vision of the location would make such a manoeuvre dangerous due to the traffic to driver and occupiers of the car.

"As shown on the proposed site layout at Appendix B, access to 64 of the proposed 66 dwellings on the site would be provided via a new simple priority junction arrangement off Mauldeth Road. The remaining 2 dwellings would be served by direct private driveways off Mauldeth Road".

See:

https://pa.manchester.gov.uk/online-applications/files/3BB55E7F11DE4C8E95F5DC45E7CDB484/pdf/142311_FO_2025-ACCESS_PLAN-2662189.pdf

10/ I object that the community consultation, which indicates a majority of local residents are against the development, has not been given due consideration in the application. Based on the results, the application should be refused on those grounds

The comments made at the consultation day raise objections to the proposed development. which also support my objections to the planning application. There was "concern that the density is too high and that the architectural style is not in keeping with the area". Another failed to see that the houses "reflect the local character". The report states that it received "Positive comments on the design of the housing and how they reflect the local character", this is not representative of my experience of the consultation day. I do not feel that the proposed development reflects the local housing in the area in any way. In answer to the question "Do you support the proposed site layout, providing car parking for each house and private garden space?". Of the respondents to this question, 34% the majority opposed the development and there was a further 23.4% but without any explanation of what that partial support was for in the scheme, for example, such as social housing on the site etc. Overall 59.4% did not support the development to 25% who did. I would conclude that objections to the planning application far outweighed those in favour.

11/ I object that the scheme does not meet Manchester's Housing Policies.

The proposed development does not align with the Manchester Core Strategy with regard to South Manchester states in its H6 policy:

"High density development in South Manchester will generally only be appropriate within the district centres of Chorlton, Didsbury, Fallowfield, Levenshulme, and Withington, as part of mixed use schemes. Outside the district centres priorities will be for housing which meets identified shortfalls, including family housing and provision that meets the needs of elderly people, with schemes adding to the stock of affordable housing".

The application does not meet these criteria which urges for mixed use schemes and ignores the

identified shortfall highlighted. Furthermore, Burnage is not a District Centre.

The planned development ignores the growing needs of the growing elderly population and their need for suitable accommodation. Manchester Core Strategy 2012 states:

"There is a shortage of housing for elderly and disabled people. The number of elderly people is growing and there is likely to be a disproportionate increase in the number of disabled people as the population becomes older. To meet this need, additional housing is necessary, which is or can be adapted. This will include the provision of high quality small units which will encourage older households, which are currently under-occupying socially rented houses which are larger than they require, to move into smaller units in their local area. All new dwellings must be of sufficient design quality and size to allow for adaptations to meet changed housing needs and provide satisfactory levels of privacy for existing households."

The Manchester Housing Strategy (2022-2032) Ambitions and Measures of Success (P13) states:

"We will increase the supply of homes attractive to older residents who are currently under occupying family housing, ensuring that there is the right home at the right time when they are ready to move".

Finally, the Manchester Core Strategy with regard to South Manchester and states in its H6 policy:

"Outside the district centres priorities will be for housing which meets identified shortfalls, including family housing and provision that meets the needs of elderly people, with schemes adding to the stock of affordable housing".

Burnage is not a District Centre.

The proposed scheme does not meet the above criteria. It offers little incentive to older people who would only be likely to move to the few ground floor flats in the scheme. There is the question as to whether or not the properties can be adapted to meet the needs of disabled individuals, for example wheelchair users or older people with low or no mobility looking for accommodation in the Burnage area. There is no mention of adaptability of the proposed housing. One option for the site would be to replicate Dahlia House in Burnage is:

"Dahlia House is a new 'With Care' social housing development for older people, completed in January 2022. It has transformed a brownfield former industrial laundry site in Burnage into 56 Age Friendly apartments for social rent for people over 55. Occupants will also have access to a flexible range on on-site care packages and support, depending on their current and future needs. The environmentally friendly scheme will also provide affordable heating and hot water for tenants from a ground source heating system".

This type of development would have been ideal for the Cricket Club site. It would have been available for local people who could release family housing and also cater for hospitals discharges of patients from the area in need of such care. The latter being a national and local priority.

12/ I wish to object to the proposal to develop cricket pitches at the Cringle Playing Fields as it does not meet the Sport England criteria for such. Further assessment needs to be undertaken as outlined below. Further I believe it would not be proper for the Council to agree to flexibility as the outcome could be no replacement of the cricket wickets at all.

The proposals contained in the Sport Mitigation Strategy and Agronomy Report do not confirm that the proposed pitch is a viable ongoing proposal. There is a need for further assessments to prove that the Planning Application's sports proposal is possible. I will explain my reasons for this conclusion below and include further barriers to the success of the sports mitigation strategy. These barriers to an effective solution are mostly contained in the Planning Application's documents.

The Sport Mitigation Strategy states:

"In contrast the STRI agronomy report sets out how a new fine turf cricket square and outfield could be developed at Cringle Fields, which would meet all technical requirements in terms of square quality, boundary size and alignment".

The Sport England criteria for replacing a playing field is:

"The area of playing field to be lost as a result of the proposed development will be replaced, prior to the commencement of development, by a new area of playing field:

- of equivalent or better quality, and
- of equivalent or greater quantity, and
- in a suitable location, and
- subject to equivalent or better accessibility and management arrangements".

This obligation from Sport England prevents firstly, the approval of the planning application until a full assessment of the proposal at Cringle Fields concludes that a fine cricket square is viable at Cringle Fields and there is "equivalent or better accessibility and management arrangements".

The current Planning Application does not meet that criteria and further steps are needed to be taken by the applicant in order to meet them.

There are number of objections which highlight the continued need for assessment of the suitability of Cringle Fields for the desired cricket wickets prior to the approval of the application on the following grounds as detailed below:

The Agronomy Report states in its Recommendations 5.5 P35:

"The purpose of this exercise is to illustrate that it is possible to accommodate the square and outfield, taking into account the spatial constraints of the site".

There are three wickets on Cringle Fields as displayed in Fig 3.2 P17 of the Sports Mitigation Strategy. "Three artificial cricket wickets were identified on the site. One of these concrete wickets was in poor condition and not in use". There is therefore no indication in the Strategy that there has been a use of them nor an interest from the local community to activate their use and I assume there is none. This is compared to the enthusiasm of the cricket matches organised voluntarily on an artificial wicket in Platt Fields. Currently the current proposal has no organised and committed community support, no management committee and committed personnel to assist with the running of the club whether paid or volunteers. This lack of support, beyond local schools who made no firm commitment to the proposal and sports organisations, creates a major organisation task as well as funding for sporting equipment, arranging fixtures etc. Currently this does not meet the Sport England criteria for "management arrangements".

Finally, Sport England's criteria states: "The area of playing field to be lost as a result of the proposed development will be replaced, prior to the commencement of development, by a new area of playing field". The proposal is not advanced sufficiently to confirm that new cricket wickets will be provided at Cringle Field and for the Council to approve the Planning Application on the grounds of flexibility would be inappropriate. If it is found that cricket wickets were not viable at Cringle Fields and the housing development commenced. No alternative sports field would have been provided at a loss to the local community but would the housing development would continue? My thought that it would.

13/ I object on the grounds that Cringle Fields is not a suitable location for the proposed grass cricket pitch due to the lack of protection for the new pitches from damage to be caused by vandalism/misuse.

The existing fine turf cricket pitches named in the Sports Migration Strategy (P2) are in enclosed grounds with sufficient protection from damage and well regarded in their neighbourhoods. The grounds provide adequate protection from the risk of ball strike in their locations. They will have security for their grounds, a grounds person/ caretaker and an active management committee. The clubs also have a clubhouse which provides the foundation for the Club's finances from players etc and from outside bookings for events. Burnage Cricket Club in its heyday would have had a similar set up.

Currently the Cringle Playing Fields has changing rooms with outside walls painted by artists which is visually interesting and has minimised graffiti. The same applies to a locked container which is separate from the changing rooms. What I assume is the entrance, within an inlet

between the two wings of the building, to the changing rooms has a high metal fence. The walls of the 2 wings have not been painted and they are covered in graffiti. The fence appeared to have suffered damage from possibly people climbing over it. Within the inlet are goal posts and on the floor there are bits and pieces of goalposts. There are no windows. The building and the container are fortified to prevent vandalism. The building edges are over grown as are most of the pavements. There is a very small tarmac car park but cars have been parking on the grass along the side of the building. There are deep inundations in the grass caused by vehicles. There is a warning sign saying there is uneven ground as there are deeper vehicle indentions on the playing field side of the changing rooms.

The Sports Mitigation Strategy states:

"Some quality issues have arisen with the NTPs that have been installed on parks sites, predominantly due to damage / public misuse" (Section 2.15)

The Sports Mitigation Strategy refers to only one other public location for cricket and states:

"Within the south area, the quality of facilities at Alexandra Park is standard (issues with maintenance / public park location)"

The Newton Heath Cricket Club, described as poor quality (Section 2.13), also suffered in 2012 and had decided to close however:

"Newton Heath CC has been saved by overwhelming local support among the Manchester community after persistent vandalism, fly-tipping and burglaries".

See - <https://www.club-cricket.co.uk/news/details/122>

Cringle Park and Cringle Fields have had reported incidents in the media. Cringle Park had an assault and rape of a woman six years ago. A campaign and petition was initiated to improve lighting in the park but without success. Cringle Fields has also been damaged following a travellers' encampment with vehicles and caravans in 2020. Residents reported significant damage to the field during this time. I therefore believe is not a suitable location for the proposed cricket pitches.

The adjoining Heaton Moor Golf Course has suffered regular unreported damage such as to greens and fairways by bicycles and electric bicycles, greens damaged by digging, stealing flagpoles from greens and annoying/ abusing members etc as they play on the golf course. There has also been damage/break in attempts at the clubhouse. With the arrival of the cricket pitches and the water supply that adjoins it they are more than likely to face similar incidents. Access from Errwood Rd to Stockport, and vice versa, is available on public footpaths nearby to Cringle Fields

at Shawbrook Road and Westdale Gardens.

14/ I object to the application as there is no certainty about where the site of the proposed cricket pitches will be until and unless further investigations are conducted by the applicant. Therefore, the application should be dismissed until the above concerns are addressed, the site for the wickets is confirmed and meet the conditions required for a senior cricket pitch.

The Agronomy Report States in its Recommendations 5.5 P35:

"The purpose of this exercise is to illustrate that it is possible to accommodate the square and outfield, taking into account the spatial constraints of the site".

The need to locate the exact position of the cricket pitches requires further work as is highlighted by the Agronomy Report P9:

"Further design work is required to finalise the exact location of the proposed cricket square within the northern area of Cringle Playing Fields".

With the exact location is confirmed then the following issues can be resolved.

15/ I object to the Planning Application as no assessment has been made to consider the consequences of ball strikes, this is particularly relevant given there is no indication of the exact location of proposed wickets. Again this should be done prior to the further consideration of the application. There may be a number safety measures needed to ensure the safety of members of the public accessing Cringle Fields, the safety of residents and their property on all sides of the park, for example Avon Road and the factory adjacent to Cringle Fields. It would also include pedestrians walking along the park side of Errwood Rd. The ball strike report by LABOSPORT must be conducted prior to the approval of the planning application.

"Due to the relatively small area of the site, it is thought that there is a risk of ball strike for the surrounding housing and road area therefore deeming the site further unsuitable for Cricket".

P29 Agronomy Report P29

"A ball strike assessment, has been commissioned by LABOSPORT and the findings of this will be implemented as part of the overall strategy and costs allocated to deliver the recommended approach. They may be a requirement for a ball strike assessment to be carried out as part of the next stage of the works to assess the requirement for any mitigation measures such as fencing or netting to prevent balls leaving the site. This is particularly relevant for the northern, eastern and western boundaries". P29 Strategy Agronomy Report

15/ I object to the proposed scheme as a detailed model as not been provided indicating the exact

location of the proposed fine grass wicket/wickets and if it is possible to construct it in that position once established. This again needs to be resolved prior to the approval of the development at the former Burnage Cricket ground.

Agronomy Report P32 5.5 Recommendations.

"It should be noted that a detailed earthworks model has not been developed for the natural grass square, and this may influence the exact location of the pitch within the Cringle Playing Fields site. The purpose of this exercise is to illustrate that it is possible to accommodate the square and outfield, taking into account the spatial constraints of the site". Agronomy Report P32 5.5 Recommendations. Agronomy Report P8.

16/ The risk of flooding on the site has not been thoroughly resolved within the application and again must be resolved before application approval:

"The site lies within Flood Zone 2, which indicates a medium risk of flooding. Any significant earthworks on the site would require a flood risk assessment. which indicates a medium probability of flooding".

There is uncertainty at times in the Agronomy Report as to whether or not there is a drainage system within Cringle Fields. This would be an essential system to prevent flooding etc and its non-presence would be a major factor in assessing the viability or not of Cringle Fields to be suitable for cricket wickets.

"Client-provided information indicated that a primary drainage system was installed in the northern area of the playing field (where the proposed cricket pitch will be located) around 2002/2003. This system is believed to include a secondary drainage component and is the primary reason the site remained dry at the time of the visit, despite the sandy clay loam topsoil, which typically exhibits poor drainage properties due to its high content of fine particles like clay and silt". Agronomy Report 1.3 P 8.

See Agronomy Report 5.2.6 Drainage - which states no drainage system was observed and "no drain lines in the form of droughted turf lines were observed when assessing aerial imagery" and "no drainage features were observed at the time of the visit and no drain lines in the form of droughted turf lines were observed when assessing aerial imagery".

The adjacent Heaton Moor Golf Course has ongoing problems with rain caused mud, surface water and flooding. The surface weakness is due to rain throughout the course. The course has been subject to flooding over recent years leaving the ground unsuitable for play. This is particularly a problem on the back nine where the 10th hole fairway/green is next to the corner of Cringle Fields. This experience would suggest that further investigation of Cringle Fields susceptibility to water damage is necessary.

In reviewing the condition of Burnage Cricket Club, the Agronomy Report states that:

"The information obtained confirms that the average rainfall experienced at the former Burnage Cricket Club site is above the England average" 4.1.4. Climate P14.

This also applies to Cringle Fields

See Agronomy Report 5.4. P30 also - Summary Risk Register notes that the climate locally is Climate Above average annual rainfall".

Soil analysis of the two sites suggest comparisons between them.

Burnage Cricket Club

"Laboratory analysis identified the topsoil as clay loam, characterised by a high proportion of fine particles and a low amount of coarse sand. Such soils are unsuitable for cricket outfield without a specialised drainage system due to their low infiltration rates, which hinder surface water removal". P 6 & 7 Agronomy Report

Cringle Fields

Soil texture: Sandy clay loam Agronomy Report P26

"Laboratory analysis confirms that the site topsoil falls into the clay loam textural classification. The soil has a high proportion of fine particles ('fines') comprising of 26% silt and 21% clay. There was a low proportion of larger very coarse sand (1%), coarse sand (5%) and medium sized sand (19%) particles. The relatively high proportion of fine particles and the general distribution of particle sizes means that the hydraulic conductivity of the indigenous topsoil is likely to be limited." Agronomy Report P 26

Also in its Summary Risk Register Box 15 on P31 states:

"Further investigations and design work is required to develop the exact specification and construction methodology. Sandy clay loam topsoil. Site topsoil is not optimal for the development of a cricket square".

Finally, the comments above are from the main issues in the above Risk Register. the Agronomy Report clarifies the results of its work by stating its work: "is intended for information purposes to assist in assessing the current condition of the site and the constraints to the development".

"The following information provides a summary of the risks associated with the development of a natural grass cricket square and outfield within the Cringle Playing Fields site. The following does

not constitute a designer risk register, instead it is intended for information purposes to assist in assessing the current condition of the site and the constraints to the development".

Agronomy Report Section 5.4 P31

17/ In summary, I object to the Planning Application as there is a need for further assessment of the proposal to utilise Cringle Fields which has not been effectively assessed, as concluded above by the Planning Application's Agronomy Report on the issue of vandalism etc, ball strike, the failure to indicate the exact location of the pitches, risk of flooding and the need to provide a designer risk register as indicated by the Agronomy report to fully understand the suitability of Cringle Fields to replace the Former Burnage Cricket ground. Approval cannot therefore be given to the Planning Application 142311/FO/2025 due to the issues raised by the design etc of the housing development as stated earlier and the uncertainty without further inspection of and confirmation that Cringle Fields can be used for a fine turf cricket square and, other wickets, and an outfield at Cringle Fields. Finally, I ask that the Council does not use flexibility to approve the application considering the issues raised in the objections outlined in this document.

I would finally wish to object to the positioning of the 2 properties described below and the failure of the Traffic assessment to consider traffic from the Kingsway junction towards Burnage as this would have given a more accurate picture of the traffic using Mauldeth Rd.

"As shown on the proposed site layout at Appendix B, access to 64 of the proposed 66 dwellings on the site would be provided via a new simple priority junction arrangement off Mauldeth Road. The remaining 2 dwellings would be served by direct private driveways off Mauldeth Road".

See:

https://pa.manchester.gov.uk/online-applications/files/3BB55E7F11DE4C8E95F5DC45E7CDB484/pdf/142311_FO_2025-ACCESS_PLAN-2662189.pdf

The properties are too close to the corner of Kingsway/ Mauldeth Rd junction - see diagram below. The vision available from that position to exit directly onto Mauldeth Rd is poor. That view is obstructed by the carpet business, the vehicles parked in the carpet's business parking area including cars, vans and larger vehicles delivering carpets. The users of these parking spaces would also be subject to traffic emerging from Mauldeth Rd opposite and from vehicles turning left from Kingsway up Mauldeth Rd. A right turn onto Mauldeth Rd from the spaces would be difficult and potentially dangerous from the spaces.

Furthermore, the diagram does not show the right turn into Broadhill Rd which will further complicated exiting from these driveways. This is in regular use for vehicles to access the shops/businesses opposite the development, the nursery on Broadhill Rd and access to Broadlea Rd and the sizeable estate of housing between Broadhill Rd and Green End Road. This junction

slows down traffic both going up to Burnage Lane and through the Mauldeth Rd/Kingsway junction. It slows down the traffic on Mauldeth Rd as there is no yellow box to for access through the queue to access Brookfield Rd. This holds up traffic heading to Burnage Lane. This junction at Brookfield Rd is not considered in the Transport Assessment and its inclusion in the traffic survey would have led to a larger count of vehicles using Mauldeth Rd/Kingsway junction than the Transport Assessment reported.

The worst scenario is if the cars from these driveways reverse onto the main road. This is the likely means to park in order to avoid attempting a reverse manoeuvre on Mauldeth Rd. The poor vision of the location would make such a manoeuvre dangerous due to the traffic to driver and occupiers of the car.

"As shown on the proposed site layout at Appendix B, access to 64 of the proposed 66 dwellings on the site would be provided via a new simple priority junction arrangement off Mauldeth Road. The remaining 2 dwellings would be served by direct private driveways off Mauldeth Road".

See:

https://pa.manchester.gov.uk/online-applications/files/3BB55E7F11DE4C8E95F5DC45E7CDB484/pdf/142311_FO_2025-ACCESS_PLAN-2662189.pdf

18/ I wish to object to the planning application on transport grounds as its Transport Assessment fails to fully reflect traffic management issues surrounding the former Burnage Cricket Club site as follows:

The failure of Manchester Council to advise the planning applicant (142311/FO/2025) of the need to consider the impact of the approval of the B & M store (141306/FO/2024) application and to take this into account in its Transport Assessment for its planning application for the Burnage Cricket ground development.

In the Transport Assessment (142311/FO/2025) for Burnage Cricket ground, it states:

"No committed developments were identified in the MCC highways pre-application advice. It is therefore assumed that there are no committed developments in the local area that would affect traffic flows past the proposed site". Section 7.3 P19

The word "committed" is an understatement of the situation. In the Planning, Affordable Housing statement and SCI for the B&M Store development it states that:

"A pre-application enquiry for the original application was submitted to the Council on May 25th 2022 and, subsequently, three pre-application meetings took place with officers... Since the withdrawal of the original application, a series of ongoing pre-application meetings and

discussions have taken place". Sections 6.3 6.4 P31

As the Council had been working with the applicant for the B&M store development for a considerable amount of time and did not inform the Burnage Cricket ground applicant to assess its impact on its application for the Burnage Cricket Ground is unacceptable.

The B&M store development was approved on the 20th February 2025 and the Burnage Cricket ground application was validated for consideration on the 4th March 2025. Therefore, B&M store development was fully approved before the application for the current application was accepted.

19/ The Transport Assessment is insufficiently detailed with regard to traffic management as it excludes the B&M store development's impact on traffic levels in the area.

As a local resident, the main traffic management issue relating to the development is the increase in traffic on the intersection between Mauldeth Rd and Broadhill Rd, the junctions of Mauldeth Rd with Kingsway in both directions, the Kingsway junction with Grangethorpe Drive and Talbot Rd and the Mauldeth Rd junction. All of these junctions will be under greater pressure due to the B&M development and will affect the Burnage Cricket development. This would have influenced the conclusion of the Transport Assessment.

"With regard to the wider highway network, it is concluded that increases in traffic as a result of the proposals would be below the 30 vehicle threshold (referred to by MCC highways in the pre-application advice) at which traffic assessments are typically required, could likely be accounted for through daily variation and would have no notable impact on the operation of the wider highway network".

20/ I wish to object that there is no indication if the proposed development will require the closure of one side of Mauldeth Rd in order to facilitate utility connections to the site. Thereby causing considerable disruption to traffic in the surrounding area.

There is no indication of how the site would be connected to the sewage system and to the required utilities for the development. This would presumably involve the closure of the development's side of Mauldeth Rd for some time. This would cause immense traffic problems for local residents and for traffic management. It should have been considered in the application.

As the surface of the site is prone to rainfall causing a soft surface, there is a problem of heavy vehicular access to and on the site. The likelihood of the site becoming a soft surface has consequences of material on vehicle wheels leaving the site will cause transfer of material from the site on to surrounding roads. This is not considered by the planning Application.

21/ I also object to the Planning Application as it ignores the issue of parking and the level of parking provided is insufficient for the site occupants leading to parking problems for local

residents and businesses.

If they are insufficient, the need for parking will overspill into the surrounding area. The Planning Inspectorate appeal decision (Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/W/19/3241898) stated in relation to an earlier development on Kingsway Business Centre, 140 Kingsway, opposite Burnside Drive stated:

"There are few available on-street parking spaces in the vicinity of the appeal site, and most of the surrounding roads are subject to parking restrictions. At the time of my site visit, I also noted that the vast majority of the existing on-street spaces were occupied. Moreover, both the Council and local residents refer to high demand for parking spaces in the area it would be likely to place additional strain on existing on-street spaces".

The main problem is clearly apparent on Kingsway where pavement parking is the norm. The Kingsway houses between Burnside Drive and Mauldeth Rd already have cars parked on the pavement requiring pedestrians etc to manoeuvre around the cars parked there. It is particularly difficult for people with prams/ shopping trolleys/mobility aids. As the site will have an exit onto Kingsway, this can readily encourage car owners from the development to park on the pavement there. The next choice would be the parking spaces for the businesses opposite the development on Mauldeth Rd. These parking spaces are essential for deliveries and for passing vehicle customers to purchase items at the Londis small supermarket store on the corner of Mauldeth Rd and Broadhill Rd. Cars from the development opposite parking in those spaces will reduce business for the store and access to other businesses there considerably as a result. The Londis store has introduced to its small parking area a fine etc if a car remained parked there for more than 25 minutes as a result of their parking spaces being misused. Deliveries by large vehicles would be at particular difficulties. The lorries delivering carpets to the premises on the corner of Mauldeth Rd/Kingsway park over the pavement at the corner to deliver carpets. The Transport Assessment believes that the double yellow lines on the entrance side of Mauldeth Rd to the site will be a means to avoid blocking. Unfortunately, this is not the case and the area is not covered by traffic wardens. People do park on the double yellow lines to access the shops opposite the development if the public parking is full. This creates difficulties for cars going towards Burnage Lane on the part of Mauldeth Rd which borders the development. The remaining parking choices would those roads off Mauldeth Rd. Broadfield Rd is currently the obvious choice and this road is full of cars on a daily basis currently.

I feel also that during construction that the need for parking of the cars of site workers will increase pressure on parking in the area of the development for some time. The surrounding roads in the area are also unsuitable for parking and all these factors are not considered in the application.

The Transport Assessment does not address these issues and does not see the need for mitigation in respect of traffic management.

If the parking facilities in the development are insufficient, the convenient conclusion is to park half on the road and half on the pavement outside your property. This practice is utilised in the area surrounding the proposed development. If used in the development, the roads within the development will be narrowed and as in Astor Rd that cars cannot pass alongside each other and it slows car movement down throughout the site to access to or exit from properties and to the Mauldeth Rd access/entry point. The concern that access to the site will lead to stationary traffic on Mauldeth Rd leading to unknown consequences. It would also have consequences for residents walking from the development if cars are parked in such a way. Finally, visitors' need for parking space is not considered and their preference would be to park on the pavement/road in the development due to the lack of parking available there as well as in the local area.

The Transport Assessment does not address these issues and does not see the need for mitigation in respect of traffic management.

22/ I object to the Planning Application as it does not prioritise pedestrians and others as contained in Manchester Council's policies.

I object that the Transport Assessment and the Travel Plan ignore research showing that in new housing developments the car is the first choice of residents and the current problems with the use of buses, trains, cycling and walking within Manchester and the local area. The residents will adhere to the national reliance on the use of cars as the best means of transport causing difficulties in the proposed development and for those living in the surrounding areas.

I object that the Transport Assessments underestimates the need for parking.

These are discussed below.

With regard to the planning applications, the latest Greater Manchester policy is as follows:

"The last bullet of Policy T 1 has been replaced by "Policy JP-C1: An Integrated Network" of the "Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document for Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan 2022 To 2039" (adopted on 21 March 2024) which refers at point 5 to MCC supporting a range of measures, including:

Ensuring that development and transport investment fully considers the needs of all people and those modes which make most efficient and sustainable use of limited road space, by following the hierarchy set out below (highest priority first):

- a. Pedestrians (and people using mobility aids);
- b. Cyclists, powered two-wheelers, and public transport users;
- c. People doing business or providing services (such as taxis/private hire, deliveries or waste collection)
- d. People in personal motorised vehicles".

The proposed development is in "limited road space" and it fails to meet this policy requirement.

The Government's Manual for Streets also highlights the problem of parking it states:

"A failure to properly consider this issue is likely to lead to inappropriate parking behaviour, resulting in poor and unsafe conditions for pedestrians" P99 8.1.3

Furthermore, it states:

"Car parking provision for new homes:

CABE research found that car parking remains a significant issue for residents and house buyers. Many people feel that the design for a new residential development should accommodate typical levels of car ownership and that the level of parking in new developments are often inadequate for residents' and visitors' demands. There was a general feeling among buyers of new homes that apparent attempts to restrict parking in order to curb car ownership were unrealistic and had little or no impact on the number of cars a household would require and acquire". Box on P103

Chartered Association of Building Engineers (CABE) research at:

CABE (2005) What Home Buyers Want: Attitudes and Decision Making amongst Consumers. London: CABE.

CABE (2005) What it's Like to Live There: The Views of Residents on the Design of New Housing. London: CABE.

This has recently been reinforced by the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) in 2024, it states:

"Public transport continues to trail behind car travel, with journeys taking, on average, 1.5 times longer than by car There was little or no improvement in the take up of public transport over the option of driving to local facilities from newly approved homes. The car as a mode of transport was 1.5 times faster nationally to reach key destinations from residential development, including 2 times faster to reach hospitals" Key Findings.

"As the professional body of town planners, the RTPI provides data and insight into macro trends affecting planning and development in the United Kingdom. The Location of Development series has been published by the RTPI since 2016. The goal of the series is to use data and analysis to see where new housing developments receive planning permission in England. This has helped policymakers and practitioners understand not just how many homes are approved but also whether they are in the right places.

Each instalment of The Location of Development has increased in scope and ambition. Starting with the analysis of 12 city-regions in 2016, this fourth report now covers nearly 1.6 million homes in major residential developments in England over the period 2012-2021 and builds on the findings and conclusions from the previous three reports. We partnered with LandTech for the second time, who provided access to the database of planning permissions that informs their LandInsight

product, which the RTPi synthesised with the Department for Transport's journey time model and the Office for National Statistics' Rural-Urban Classification information". Executive Summary, The Purpose of Location of Development.

The Location of Development 4

<https://www.rtpi.org.uk/research-rtpi/2024/november/lofd4report/>

This determines that within any new development, car usage is the choice of transport. Cycling is not a choice as currently there is little or no control of traffic management by the police in Burnage and elsewhere. There are no bicycle lanes on Kingsway until Talbot Road and beyond bus lanes can be used until Daisy Bank Rd. Dedicated bicycle lanes are not evident in the surrounding area. There are marking for bicycle lanes on some roads, for example Parrswood Rd but these are typically over parked by cars etc. Cycling based on these comments is unlikely to be a system of choice for transport by residents.

In an article by About Manchester, in November 2021, states:

"According to Crash Map, which uses Dft (Department for Transport) data to highlight the areas which the highest number of cycling collisions, Manchester is the fourth most dangerous city in the UK for cyclists, with 1,121 accidents including cyclists occurring in the last five years".

<https://aboutmanchester.co.uk/the-most-dangerous-areas-of-manchester-for-cyclists-revealed/>

A further report from University of Manchester's Manchester Urban Institute Blog in November 2024 states

"Despite a series of policy initiatives and the historic opportunity for mode shift during the pandemic, cycling mode share has stagnated at 2%, far below the 10% target for 2025 set by the Greater Manchester Cycling Strategy in 2014. Meanwhile, infrastructure delivery has often been piecemeal and delayed, hamstrung by political opposition to any reduction in parking spaces and motor vehicle throughput".

<https://blogs.manchester.ac.uk/mui/2024/11/14/cycling-policy-and-practice-in-greater-manchester-between-ambitious-plans-and-the-realities-of-delivery/>

5/ Neither the Transport Assessment or the Travel Plan within the planning application does not advise on the efficacy of the available transport choices, including walking, to the residents of the development.

The train system from Mauldeth Rd Station provides 2 trains per hour to Manchester Piccadilly and to Manchester Airport. The East Didsbury station caters for 4 trains per hour in both

directions. If Mauldeth Rd had the same service more choice in order to meet deadlines for the start of work etc would be available. The trains to the Manchester Airport do not stop at all the stations between Mauldeth Rd and the Airport making it difficult to disembark for employment, shopping etc at the various other stations on the route. The Manchester Airport train continues to Crewe. The train on the opposite platform from Mauldeth Rd either stops entirely at Manchester Piccadilly station or continues to Liverpool Lime St Station. The cost of regular train travel might also be prohibitive to residents of the new development, particularly larger families. Again the better choice will likely be to use a car.

The two bus services are the 50 and the 25 bus routes nearest to the development. The 50 bus service is frequent and does not keep to its published timetable. The main problem throughout the rush hour is the high level of traffic using the A34 and delaying the service in its onward journey towards Salford Quays, on weekdays, disrupts the bus timetable. There is no dedicated bus lane along the whole length of its journey. The 50 travels past Manchester Grammar school, Manchester Royal Infirmary, Manchester University and the Metropolitan University during the rush hour. It has to then traverse the city centre which due to changes in the road network and building projects, further delays the bus. The 50 then has to return through the rush hour traffic and it is impossible to sustain the published timeline. Making an arrival at work on a set time by the 50 bus route therefore is a gamble and constant lateness a problem for an employee. Returning home could also be delayed considerably. The Transport Assessment supplies details of the transport available to the new development as acceptable but does not advise in its documentation on the efficacy of the trains and buses for residents.

The 25 bus route is every half hour and travels from Stockport to the Trafford Centre. I am less aware of difficulties but it again in the rush hour period delays are inevitable as a result of heavy traffic. Again arriving to work along the 25 route would again be subject to delay. A guide to driving in Manchester indicates the problems for buses in Manchester states:

"Traffic can be heavy in Manchester, particularly in central areas where one way streets are common. Plan your route ahead of time and be prepared for congestion".

<https://adamsdrivertrainer.co.uk/blog/tips-for-driving-in-manchester/>

Adams Driver Training - Tips for Driving in Manchester June 2024.

Walking to local shops etc is likely to be undertaken. With the large numbers of families to be accommodated on the site, it is prohibitive to walk to the large supermarkets in the area even though they are some distance away. Shopping, for a family, requires a larger shopping purchase and again a car would be the most advantageous.

23/ I object that the Transport Assessment supplies details of the transport available to the new development as acceptable but does not advise in its documentation on the efficacy of the trains,

the known difficulties for buses, the dangers of cycling and the difficulties of accessing local facilities by walking, especially with large families.