

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: We strongly oppose this planning application due to traffic, parking, and road safety concerns, lack of community focus, and limited amenities in the area.

Traffic & Road Safety Issues

The surrounding roads, especially Kingsway junction, are already accident-prone (refer to government data). Increased traffic from new housing will worsen congestion and pedestrian safety, particularly near local businesses and takeaways. A recent major accident on 20th March 2025 highlights these dangers. The developer has not conducted a proper traffic and safety survey.

Parking Concerns

Side roads like Avonlea Drive, Brookthorpe Avenue, Glendale Avenue, and Kenwood Avenue already face severe parking shortages, impacting residents and emergency services. The council recently acknowledged these issues in communications about refuse collection vehicle access. The proposed development lacks sufficient on-site parking, which will lead to pavement parking and further congestion.

Loss of Potential Community & Recreational Space

While the site is currently unused, it has the potential to be transformed into a valuable community asset. A well-designed recreational facility could provide much-needed spaces for young people, helping to reduce anti-social behaviour and foster community engagement. Instead of private

development for profit, the land should be used to benefit local residents, offering sports facilities, an outdoor gym, or other amenities that promote health and social inclusion.

Loss of Visual Amenity & Privacy

Loss of Open Space: Even an unused green area contributes to a sense of spaciousness and visual appeal. The proposed development will permanently remove this open aspect.

Overlooking & Privacy Concerns: While the houses may be similar in size to existing ones, their close proximity could impact privacy, especially if windows face neighbouring properties.

Reduced Sunlight: The positioning of houses and boundary treatments (such as fences or hedges) may lead to increased shadowing, particularly in winter months. This may seem minor to most, but for those who specifically purchased their property to benefit from unobstructed views, will also experience a significant change in their living environment, potentially reducing the natural light they rely on and altering the overall feel of their home.

To minimise these impacts, we propose that developers include green buffers, plant additional trees, or reduce the height of buildings near existing homes.

Infrastructure Strain

Local services-schools, healthcare, and public transport-are already overstretched. Further development will reduce access for vulnerable residents.

Alternative Solutions

MCC should purchase the land for community use, such as a sports facility or outdoor gym.

A local charity or community organisation, with MCC's support, could manage the land for public benefit.

A legal covenant may restrict the land's use to sports purposes, meaning housing development may not be permitted.

While housing demand is recognised, this development is unsuitable. Brownfield sites should be prioritised over vital green spaces. The recently approved B&M site project should be assessed before considering further large-scale developments in the area.