

Comments for Planning Application 143413/FO/2025

Application Summary

Application Number: 143413/FO/2025

Address: Land Bound By Longford Road, Peveril Crescent, Rye Bank Road And Longford Park (commonly Referred To As Ryebank Fields) Manchester M21 9WW

Proposal: Change of use of former university playing fields to community woodland and meadow.

Case Officer: Robert Griffin

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I do not want this building to go ahead.

I am writing to add my objections to the above referenced planning permission proposal regarding the redevelopment of Chorlton precinct. Please add it to the file and raise the matters below during your meeting.

Firstly, the current proposals are wildly different from the proposals which were widely circulated to local residents through letter box information sharing. These altered proposals have not been shared sufficiently to allow local residents and businesses to appraise the plans and make well informed comments in a timely manner. In fact they have been distinctly hidden away from any publicity on the whole, compared to the original public displays. This feels intentionally underhand and secretive. Instead of the original proposals, in which houses (including social housing) were prominent, the new proposals consist of exclusively multi storey blocks of flats. This is not in keeping with the local housing stock. It does not blend in to the surrounding buildings and open spaces, especially as it will be built kerbside and not behind trees as originally proposed. Graeme House was set well back from the main road which meant it did not feel imposing - the same cannot be said for this proposal.

Secondly, there are too many blocks of flats being built around Chorlton - at the 4 banks crossroads; on the site of the old swimming baths; Albany Road industrial estate and adjacent to Beech Road Park. There is insufficient additional infrastructure for these developments and there is no evidence of appropriate infrastructure to support the additional 260+ flats being developed in this proposal. This is a massive overdevelopment of the site and will lead to significant reduction in living space, parking availability and loss of green space. Traffic through Chorlton, especially on

events days at Old Trafford, is getting worse and there is increasing evidence of the dangerous effects of traffic pollution on medical conditions ranging from asthma to dementia and cancer. The addition of so many dwellings will inevitably worsen congestion and air quality.

I am disappointed in the reneging on the commitment to social housing which seemed to be a large selling point in the original proposals.

There is a distinct lack of retail opportunity compared to original plans, with an apparent approximate 50% reduction in the number of outlets compared to the original proposal. Again, this was a major selling point and promise when the original plans were being pushed to the public (with many people opposed losing the wide variety of retailers in Chorlton) which again has radically changed with zero publicity.

I am also struggling to see how the planning committee will maintain their neutrality in decision making on this project when the land is owned by GMPF . The planning committee, councillors, all council employees and others involved in the decision stand to benefit from this plan going ahead, and therefore cannot be believed to act neutrally in the public interest.

I am strongly in favour of redeveloping the precinct site but I strongly object to the proposals to build multiple multi storey blocks in an otherwise low rise suburb. Almost all local people would prefer a proposal with a far smaller, house-based, low density residential development, coupled with desperately needed sports / leisure provision (none in Chorlton), more retail space for a viable high street, a community hall space (none in Chorlton), more green space, as well as NHS services (in line with the new 10 year plan to bring NHS care closer to home), rather than the one track mentality of overcrowding and overpopulation through high density flats with zero provision of any of the above, placing more strain on already overstretched services and infrastructure.

Yours,

