

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. Considering the density of the proposed housing scheme, an assessment of Daylight/Sunlight should have provided.

4/ 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 wish to object to the Transport Plan. Circumstances has delayed my ability to complete this. I believe I can submit this information after the closing dates for comments. I would expect that to be by the 5th April at the latest***.

7/ 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.

8/ 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.

9/ 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

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 I 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.