

Ryebank comments

As a Newport Rd resident which along with Longford, Nichols and Ryebank rd already struggles with the amount of traffic , ... 70 houses , 2 cars per house which seems to be the norm these days it sounds like a lot of extra vehicles pushed through an already congested area . The area is serviced by 2 schools one just off Longford Rd and one on Oswald at school start and end times it is almost imposibel to to get out at either end of Newport Rd via Oswald or Ryebank due to the ammount of traffic . I regularly see road rage incidents as the cars back up around these congestion points. Also the Athletic track in Longford park can be problematic when there are too many cars to fit into their car park , these vehicals then tend to park along the nearby streets which has a knock on effect to the local residents . I fully understand no one has a given right to park outside their own house on a public road however on occasion I have had to park 10 to 15 houses away from where I live due to Athletics cars parked on the streets.

The development must have a through road to Ryebank Rd North - the traffic is too congested on Longford Rd. - The drainage must be sorted - the drains are constantly failing on Longford Rd. - The wildlife and diversity must be respected.

I accept that there is a shortage of housing and development on this site is more or less inevitable. - However i feel that these plans with the number of homes proposed particularly the F24 option with all access via Chorlton are certain to have nothing but a negative affect on the residents of surrounding roads (I live on Nicolas Road) and there is no evidence in the framework to suggest that the effect on existing residents has been or will be given any kind of consideration or priority. - - The Development Framework Summary pushes the option that would send all traffic down the Manchester side. There is no explanation of why this is preferred - why? even the suggestion of we might have to have emergency access at the trafford side is written as if its a design problem. - - The 'potential traffic management' appears to be that cars can either go down Ryebank or Longford roads. That doesn't strike me as traffic management, that's the only two options that are physically possible on the site - i.e. it isn't traffic management at all. - Q241- Points i would like to make are - - Regarding the development of the site itself - the illustrations , if they are to scale show houses that appear to have smaller footprints than the houses on Longford/Newport/Nicolas and they dont show driveways, cars etc. It feels like the plan has been drawn in a deliberately misleading way to make the development appear less dense. - - The use of the phrase 'around ' - for the number of properties. Need to be guarantees that IF an acceptable plan is produced the developer will not be allowed to build more than the agreed number. - - Access and Traffic management - this is the main issue. - the Framework - especially the preferred option, shows Zero evidence of any management planning whatsoever (Perhaps because it isn't possible to plan for that many houses with a single tucked away entrance/exit at the corner of 2 quiet residential streets) The plan shows just that cars leaving will be able to go down Ryebank or Longford - in the direction of arrows shown - no arrows depicting how vehicles will return though? - The additional traffic will have a significant negative impact on Ryebank/Longford/Newport + Nicolas Roads. especially at school run days and bin collection days. - If there is any suggestion of creating a one way system, that would be an absolute nightmare for residents on the affected roads. - There is also the issue of lorries + plant using those residential roads during construction should this go ahead. - - other points - - impact on surrounding schools.? - Impact on existing utilities - particularly broadband connections and bandwidth - Will they be connected to victorian sewage system that existing roads share? - - Will roads be adopted by the council? - There is worthy talk of integrating access to the park + site - would the be guarantees that once there have been a few burglaries the residents won't demand that their estate is fenced off and access restricted? - - would timings of development be phased so we aren't sandwiched between 2 large building projects for several years.

This area is already completely clogged with traffic and completely unsuitable for a large development with very limited vehicular access. There is no added infrastructure (schools, GP surgery) to accommodate the proposed new residents. We should be cherishing our green spaces not building houses on them!

The biggest issue here is not the housing. Chorlton should welcome new housing at both ends of the spectrum (affordable/luxury) but the location is completely impractical. I appreciate the need to develop on areas that have no unique, designated use especially in desirable districts such as Chorlton, but the very notion of using this land shows a complete lack of knowledge of the issues currently affecting these roads at present. - - I am a resident of Nicolas Road. Our road and those that run adjacent and parallel are all heavily congested. Large, family houses without driveways lead to heavy on street car parking. Two large primary schools with limited parking add to an already chaotic road system which struggles to cope with the number of cars as it is. To add approx 100+ cars with additional delivery vans, services etc would render the area unbearable. - - I cant see anything on the plans that would adequately address these issues. There is simply not the infrastructure to support these. A greatly reduced number of houses, perhaps, but certainly nothing at the level being proposed. - - I vehemently oppose this development and would suggest an alternative use of that site.

The proposed BMX park within Longford park is unlikely to interact well with the proposed development. - - - Please try to retain as many of the existing trees as practical. - - - As there's unlikely to be any affordable housing, could some of the money from the Section 106 be used to provide decent cycling infrastructure which could tempt people away from driving? The proximity to firwood metro stop could be promoted in any sales literature. - - - The adjacent field in Longford park suffers from poor drainage throughout the winter months, possibly linked to an historic culverted brook - I'm sure it will be picked up at desk study stage. - -

We should be working to protect not destroying/reduce the size of such valuable wildlife habitats and green corridors. Previous failed attempts to build on this site have highlighted the strength of opposition to such proposals and it's sad to see this important, unmanaged green space being threatened again.

I don't think you should build on the land at all! Building even a relatively small number of homes on the land will substantially increase the amount of traffic using Longford and Ryebank Roads as well as the other roads off Ryebank Rd. Daresbury Rd, which is not mentioned in the consultation document at all, is likely to be used as a rat-run by people seeking to access Edge Lane at traffic lights rather than at the uncontrolled junction of Ryebank Rd and Edge Lane, where it is very difficult to turn right. This has obvious implications for local residents who already have to deal with school traffic and the use of Daresbury Rd as a rat-run by existing traffic. - - I have been told that the water main running under the northern (Trafford) end of Ryebank Rd precludes having full road access at that point. So all the traffic is likely to come out onto the southern part of Ryebank Rd and Longford Rd. - - I would also point out that although not liable to actual flooding, the land is very wet and has poor drainage. A number of local houses regularly get standing water in their gardens during wet winters and this land would be liable to the same problem. - - The land is also a much valued green space which it would be a shame to lose. The relative wildness of it in comparison to the more manicured park nearby means that it has a different ecology and wildlife which would be lost, even with the measures suggested regarding the Nico ditch etc.

Whilst I have no objections to the development of the area per se, it will cause huge disruption with work vehicles during the build and ongoing traffic problems along Longford Road and Ryebank Road. Both of which have poor access given the amount of on street parking down both roads and the volume of traffic they already receive (and the speed bumps!). It already takes significant time to turn right onto Edge Lane in the mornings (particularly between 7:30 and 9am) and 70 houses will deliver 100+ cars, many of which will be driving to work/school at that time. - - Such a vast number of houses will also place a huge burden on the already struggling Chorlton medical centre. This is in a poor state and it is already difficult to get appointments. This development, and the one at the precinct will make matters worse and needs to be looked at. - - Likewise the development will place an extra burden on St Johns and Oswald Road Primary School. Given the selection process (largely based on proximity), these luxury houses will be at an advantage and will jump ahead of residents of other parts of Chorlton who have lived in the area for much longer. - - Also the proposals speak of the need for additional housing in Chorlton. If this is true then I cannot imagine that any area "needs" luxury houses as opposed to more affordable ones.

Although there is apparently no flood risk, my garden and under my house on Claridge road becomes waterlogged after heavy rains, this is apparently due to increased housing in the area causing water to travel down an old water course which starts in these fields. In winter, Ryebank fields are too wet to walk on, if you build on this then my home will possibly flood. - - This is a gorgeous natural area which is largely unbothered by humans. Building on it will greatly affect the more shy wild animals in the area. - - There are a lot of dogs that are walked in Longford park, an increase of this many houses in the surrounding area will likely have a significant increase in the number of dogs being walked in the park. The collection of dog poo bins will need to be increased to daily as they already overflow regularly. - - To be truly in keeping with the area, the houses would be as eco as possible.

There are plenty of 4 and 5 bedroom homes in chorlton, fir wood and Whalley range. This development should focus on 2 and 3 bed starter homes and affordable housing (rent to buy, shared ownership) so young professionals can get on to the housing ladder and out of private rented. I believe there should be a ban on private landlords buying these for rental purposes. This would ensure a development that meets the needs of the current demographic and encourage those of a similar type to move into the area rather than those just interested in renting. People wanting to put down family roots. Are there enough schools and other social infrastructure provisions for the size of the development too.

This area cannot withstand any more vehicles or people. It is already too busy, traffic on great stone road is very busy and driving down Kensington road trying to pull out onto Manchester road is lethal without adding more traffic. The vast amount of wild animals living in the land will lose their homes. With no similar type of habitat in Longford park. There are no 3 storey properties surrounding the land so this does not match the features of surrounding properties. Not all properties are Victorian as stated some are 1930s build. The surrounding schools, gps, dentists etc are already over subscribed. With no plan to build additional services like this on the site the developers are not considering where their clients will be able to receive these services and is purely money motivated. The plan does not bring anything to the surrounding neighbours of this area.

I oppose the proposal to have an entry from Ryebank Road Trafford. This is a Chorlton Development and the access should be from the Chorlton side of the site. In Trafford we already cope with heavy traffic from Mcr United ground and Old Trafford events at LCC. We pay our council tax to Trafford council and have purchased properties in a cul de sac and opening this up would mean changing the entire nature of our road, increasing traffic and creating a burden of extra pressure on our locality for a Chorlton development.

I understand there is added challenge but would strongly consider adding access from North through Rye Bank Road. This would ease the public concerns about increased traffic on Longford and surrounding roads. Also consider whether the primary school could have a drop off zone to ease the impact of their traffic on Longford. Longford is not congested due to locals. It is due to parents driving to school.

I do not think homes should be built on this site. The roads are too narrow already for all of the traffic. If this goes ahead some need to be one way.

Longford road and ryebank road are already regularly grid locked but are hideous at school drop off or pick up times. There needs to be access from somewhere else or this will be horrific ! Please consider these issues. Please come and observe this in person at St John's leaving time.

My biggest concern is the increased Traffic that will be created by this development. Longford Road, Newport Road and Ryebank Road already suffer from being near 2 popular schools. If you limit vehicle access to the new development via just Longford road you will make this congestion worse. Better to split the site and have half of it accessed via the opposite end of Ryebank road/Great Stone Road. - - My other concern is you have not made provision for any low cost or social housing. You are purely aiming to make high end 'executive homes'. If this development goes ahead you should ensure there is 30% minimum lowcost/affordable homes.

I am a resident of Ryebank Road (southern End). Please take time to consider my views. - - Firstly the consultation questions are often skewed towards answers that could be used in support of the proposals without giving an option of objection in many cases. - - These are my first thoughts and submission to the consultation in relation to development proposals for land being described as Ryebank Fields, Chorlton, Manchester. - - At the conclusion of my observations on current development documents, is the content of an email delivered to my local councillor days before I knew of the existence of the proposed development. - Please take time to read it's content as although written in relation to road speeds, it also has relevance to volume, capacity and traffic management, of vehicle access to Ryebank Road; which will be further exacerbated should 70-90 home be developed using Ryebank Road (southern end) for access. - - Comments regarding: - Manchester City Council executive document-Annex1 26/07/17. - (this appears to be a fuller document than that shown in the consultation) - - Vehicle Access - - Coming from the position that Ryebank Road, Nicholas Road, Newport Road, Longford Road and Oswald Road cannot accommodate more vehicle access because of regular congestion, road rage due to congestion, stationary vehicle damage due to congestion, high speed vehicles and 'rat running at speed' due to congestion on surrounding roads. - A position I know is supported by countless friends, neighbours and contacts from the above roads. - - When looking at traffic accessing and egressing the area, it is naive or deceptive to deal with statistics looking purely at Ryebank fields in isolation. The area described in the para. below will take traffic for all the 190 new home developments in Chorlton whether it be short cuts to avoid congestion in the centre of Chorlton or access to schools. - - 1: I am absolutely appalled at the arrogance of the paper, that on three occasions, determines that a single access for the the development off Longford Road/Ryebank Road, will ' maximise development values', pages 125, 128 and 134. - Does this describe filling the pockets of developers and Council whilst sacrificing the neighbourhood? More cars, more fumes, more noise! - Noting that the higher the value of the development the higher the Council's income from section 106 and similarly that of eventual rateable values. Could the above have undue influence over the amenity value of current residents, when final decisions are made? - - 2: It is fatuous if not delusional for the writer to use evidence from an appeal 20 years ago in relation to traffic volume arising from 90 homes exiting onto Ryebank/ Longford Roads as acceptable when car ownership per household since that period has at least doubled! - - 3: Please ensure that a thorough vehicle count, speed count and route/reason survey, covering relevant times of the day/ evening are carried out on all the above roads and junctions. This needs to be a holistic approach taking account of this area and it's relationship with the other development areas (Chorlton precinct, Chorlton baths) as they to will bring traffic through this area to schools and rat run short cuts. - - 4: Please then create a traffic management plan that does not utilise speed bumps which do not work both environmentally and as per email below. The document only describes the 'potential' for a traffic plan, which leaves doubt as to whether it will happen. - - 5: Please ensure that 3 and 4 are completed and consulted on before Planning takes place, there must be a traffic management plan that cannot be pushed into the long grass and leave the community to pay the price of development 'strategy'. - - - Housing plan options. - - - 6: The document appears disingenuous when describing 3 of the 4 options having vehicle access from both ends of Ryebank Road giving the impression of open mindedness, but then states these will only be for emergency vehicles, why can the north end of Ryebank Road not be considered a viable route, exiting quickly onto a wide thoroughfare with easy access to all routes. Is this because neighbouring councils are unable to agree access or does ' maximising value' come into play again. It would be shameful if either of these were correct! - - 7: Page 133 describes a preferred option but does not appear then to describe which it is. Nor did I see it anywhere else. I am left with an impression that the consultation could be a sham if there is disclosure should it not open and honest? - - 8: of the two option that are further explored in 2 and 4, the writer appears

to lean towards option 4, however by the time gardens front and back are added there appears to be little room left for anything that could be considered public space. Option 2 does seem to have a lengthy corridor that could be accessed by the public and extend views. - - 9: There is talk in the document of potential assistance for parking for St Johns School but none of the options appear to show how that could be accommodated. Is there a tendency to float attractive items without fulfilling them in practice? In the strive to 'maximise value' it's hard to see these coming to fruition if developers are not held to account prior to planning applications being submitted. - - Email content: - - Councillor Newman - Hello Shiela - My name is , also a fellow resident of Ryebank Road . - A year or two ago I spoke with you about the ever increasing speeds of vehicles travelling the length of Ryebank Road. You explained the then to be, Council policy of 20 mph speed limits. - The gentle persuasion of signage in an attempt to change driver behavior appeared to be generally failing when I went to one of the Councillor surgeries and spoke with Councillor Hacking who explained similar concerns across a wide swathe of Chorlton. - We discussed - Enforcement, - Road closure and - Road manipulation, - I understand the likes of enforcement has an extremely minimal effect: - Road closures may be difficult and manufacturing road constrictions expensive. - - However I do now believe that the status quo is not a sustainable position, with life and property being put at risks with excessive speeds of 60± mph being regularly achieved on Ryebank Road. - - Although this email is lengthy would you be good enough to seriously consider my concerns and proposals and if at all possible seek out opportunities to make a difference. - - Causes: - I will return to the above solutions if I may once I have covered what in my opinion has caused the changes in recent years. I do this, to highlight the problem and so as the solution options can be compared to the causes so as to judge whether they would be effective. - Traffic congestion in Chorlton center causes drivers to seek a cut -through between Manchester Road and Edge Lane. The cut-through becomes a high speed 'rat run', for a significant number of frustrated drivers. - The above route means all traffic whether using Longford, Newport or Nicholas Roads filter on to Ryebank Road making them basically a Trunk Road, not a residential road. - The 20 mph speed limit in purely residential areas is in my opinion to be applauded, however through recent media and observations it has been shown completely ineffective with media reports talking of it being abandoned with no enforcement confirming to drivers they can disregard it. - The significant rise in delivery services utilising parcel and supermarket delivery vehicles; both of which attempting to meet volume or time deadlines has seen large vehicles hurtling along the road. - Road humps currently in place fail to deter delivery vehicle speeds as damage and vehicle maintenance are not the concern of the driver. - The valued rise in popularity of the athletics stadium creates a rising number of late arriving drivers frustrated by lack of parking space in the allocated car park using speed and 'road rage' to try and achieve their start time. - Similar to the above note, is the change over recent years of car usage in delivering and collecting children from local schools. - Lastly but equally if not more dangerous is those drivers that have no respect or regard for others who drive at enormous speed just because they have access to high powered vehicles legally or otherwise. Late evening appears to be a particularly favourite time to travel at motorway speeds along a purely residential road. - Terminal velocity/speed appears to be reached between Nicholas Road and Daresbury Road and vice versa depending on which way the vehicle has travelled from. - - Solution Options: - Enforcement: I think singular use of 'hand held' radar devices used by enforcement officers has little effect, due to the knowledge of its use not being available to those drivers from without the district which the majority are. Secondly the availability of enforcement officers is at an absolute premium and as such discountable as a viable option. - Enforcement: Digital Average Speed Cameras would potentially work but would require a network covering the surrounding roads. As such I would imagine that the installation, ongoing maintenance and enforcement could be prohibitive. - Enforcement: Automatic Number plate Recognition devices linked to regulation prohibiting through traffic is used in other Greater Manchester borough's potentially works. I have no knowledge of How this affects the residential population within the zone. - Road Closures: This potentially is the most effective and simple solution, notwithstanding what is legally required to effect this, either temporarily or permanently. Although I possess no knowledge of process Manchester City Council manages to do it. Councillor Val Stephens once suggested the option of a closure on Ryebank Road adjacent to No.256. Creating two cul-de-sacs. Access to Longford Park is still readily available from Edge Lane, whilst the other section of Ryebank, and Nicholas and Newport Roads would be accessed from Manchester Road or Wilbraham Road. - Linked to and in conjunction with No4. above, the possibility of a regulatory, circulating one way street system could be utilised, within the group of roads, Nicholas, Newport and Longford. This would support the ease of flow of vehicles attempting to reach and leave St John's School, delivery drivers and local residents in no particular order. - Road Constriction: Putting a constriction or chicane in the road in a similar position as No4 above would I believe reduce the speed on Ryebank Road significantly and be value for money in order to protect life, but still leaves those drivers trying to save time, opportunity to speed up down Longford, Newport and Nicholas Roads thereby requiring similar schemes on each thereby quadrupling costs to be effective. - - I humbly suggest that, No4 integrated with No5 would cover the bullet pointed Causes described above. Whereas the other options would only have partial opportunity to succeed. - I can obviously not speak for other local residents but respectfully suggest that a safer environment would be high on most people's wishes, foregoing the potential of a few minutes journey time. - I also accept that these are my own personal observations and would require technical verification in support of the claims I make. - There may/will be other Causes and Solutions than those I describe above, I would of course meet with you and your colleagues to discuss the issues further if it would help; and provide support practically if of value to you. - Please do not hesitate to contact if I can be of assistance. - - Thank you for taking the time to read this. - -

Is it possible to improve access to St Johns School? - Two entrances to the site, from Longford Road (south) and Ryebank Road (north) would allow greater access to the surrounding area. - Why try to build homes with "Victorian character"? It's the 21st century, build something modern. Longford Road is Edwardian anyway.

Placing new housing here is not the right thing to do. It will stretch amenities too far. The local schools are already oversubscribed. Placing more housing here will put a further strain on this. It is already difficult to get dentist and doctor appointments at local practices which have so many people in them. More housing here will further this problem. The amount of traffic around Longford Road is dangerous, especially during the term in the mornings and evenings, not only at the start and end of the school day but later when children have been at clubs etc. Parking on the roads nearby does not help. The roads in the surrounding area also suffer from people driving to Oswald Road Primary School as well as St John's Primary School. Placing housing on this site with access onto Ryebank Road Chorlton or Longford Road will only exacerbate the problem. There is a further problem of traffic and poor parking in the immediate locality, especially during the summer months. This is when Longford Stadium is used for Athletics meetings, often hosting to hundreds of people who come from far & wide - Wales, Birmingham, Cumbria to name a few. The car park is overrun & people park inappropriately on all of the surrounding streets at least 3 times a week during athletics season. The track is Trafford council yet the streets being put in danger are in Manchester and nothing seems to get done about it. The roads in the area (Ryebank, Oswald, Nicolas, Newport & Longford) are dangerous enough without creating a reason (housing) for more passing traffic. The impact on all of the local roads will be significant. In addition, if the housing must go ahead there should be no through access from both sides of Ryebank road for any motorised vehicle. This will create a rat run. If houses must be built on this land the access should be on the other side of Ryebank Road in Firwood. This would take away from any issues regarding the local primary schools & the athletics track. Furthermore, If houses are necessary, what is the guarantee this will be affordable housing? The recent developments in Didsbury at the MMU former campus were completely unaffordable to most people (4 bedroom properties started at over £1million). Smaller apartments & flats were less than this but not suited to most families. If there has to be housing, a 2 storey maximum height is appropriate. - As this was once a university sports facility & there is a proposed sports university to open in Stretford; UA92, which will be located within very close proximity to this site, why can the site not be sold to them and redeveloped as a sports facility, with pitches & changing rooms, restored to its original use & used by UA92 instead of for housing? This would be a better proposal and of more benefit to the local community by adding to it rather than putting extra pressure on roads and services.

There is no space to have traffic entering this site from Longford Road. It is already overused by school run traffic to St John's and Oswald Road schools. There is residential parking on both sides of Longford Road. There will be significantly increased traffic, creating more danger for pedestrians, particularly school children walking to school. This will also encourage school traffic to use the neighbouring Newport, Nicholas and Daresbury Roads as a rat run, which will increase the risk to children and families commuting on foot.

I disagree with the redevelopment as proposed principally because the density of the planned increase housing and the apparent preference for the lack of adequate access to the site (by not ensuring adequate through traffic from Longford Road to Rye Bank Road) will considerably increase congestion along Longford Road which when coupled with the existing congestion which occurs during school times when Longford Road becomes grid locked both before school starts and at the end of the school day will make the lives of the residents both along and off Longford Road increasingly miserable. Before any development is planned of this site the Council needs to address the congestion problem along Longford Road (eg by providing a residential permit parking scheme or preferably a permanent one way system (for Longford Road and Newport Road).

This site should be retained and developed for recreational use and not built on at all.

There is insufficient access through a very narrow Longford road to accommodate what could be a further 140 + cars. Creating a danger and further traffic problems. These are family homes. There is no extra infrastructure being planned to increase local school provisions local doctors etc to accommodate extra residents.

Traffic on Longford, Newport and Nicolas Road is bag at peak times. A one way system should be considered to ease traffic flow.

I'm very concerned that this framework in no way addresses my huge concerns around the increased traffic on already mega busy roads. Also what impact will 70 new homes have on local school places and what are the council proposing to tackle this? These plans are I'll thought out...

The road leading from Chorlton to Stretford is always backed up with traffic. 70 more homes this size in that area will bring with it 2 cars per property making it 140 cars at least. This will add more traffic to an already busy area. These are huge homes so will not be affordable and typically will only cater for the wealthy. This is shameful from a Labour council. Labour are supposed to support the working classes, not the elite.

This is a major concern - "All new homes will be a maximum of 3 storeys and will respect the heights of existing neighbouring properties." I think it should be clear that any on longford road should be a maximum of 2 storeys to respect the existing houses. - - The questions about shared streets - Pedestrians, People on bikes, and cars should have separate zones, or otherwise pedestrians and bikes should be the priority (vulnerable road users considered first) and should be reflected in the design principles. Perhaps even a 10mph speed limit in place.

Longford road is far too congested already, another 70 homes needing access from it will cause major problems

I view it as important that access is not disrupted, even through the construction phase.

My concern is that once this greenspace is gone it is gone forever and as an overgrown wilderness it is home to foxes, birds, bats and other wildlife that is less likely to flourish in the landscaped parkland of Longford Park. - - Also I feel that the traffic situation in the area will be made worse by adding more housing, 70 'executive' homes is probably going to equal 140 cars. Ryebank Road is already hugely congested, especially on days when there are events at the sports stadium. Also the roads off it - Longford Road, Newport Road and Nicholas Road are often gridlocked during school run times, there are few passing places on these roads, resulting in difficulty for traffic to travel along the roads at busy times. This is a potential issue for emergency vehicles as well as an ongoing difficult issue for all local car driving or cycling residents. - - Local schools are already full so I also worry about how they would cope with an extra 60 or 70 families. - - I realise there is a need for housing, however I feel quite strongly that building a number of executive homes has nothing to do with solving the housing crisis and everything to do with MMU making money from this land. I would prefer it to be sold to Trafford Council and incorporated into Longford Park but left as a wild area for wildlife and for Trafford Council to maybe sell off some of Turn Moss for housing - much of this is currently just used as football pitches so isn't the wildlife haven that Ryebank Fields is and there is an access road down there already with about 12 house so there wouldn't be such a traffic issue.

this area is full of wildlife I have seen bats squirrels insects (bees) lots of birds and is used on a daily basis by walkers and dog walkers and has been for 15 years, this area needs to be left wild to accommodate our ever decreasing wildlife the park is managed and not left wild like this land is and is precious to the area, the trees provide important oxygen for the suburban area. the traffic issue is a massive reason not to build here, potentially there will be 140 cars moving in rush hour in an already congested area with 3 schools extremely close by, this will lend itself to an enormous - pressure on the area daily - there is also the water pipe that runs through the Trafford end of this proposed plan that if damaged would cut all water to the area instantly.

I don't want the fields to go but accept housing is needed and that this plot is under-used. The type of housing seems appropriate. - I am pleased you are concerned about how the development look and how it will link in with the park and local housing,. - My major concern is the Longford Road access. A through road would be a disaster and 70 extra houses all feeding in to the Longford Road will create big problems. - Traffic on Longford Road and Ryebank Road is awful and congestion is frequent. Getting out of Ryebank Road is difficult at rush hour and becomes much worse at school times and when big events take place at the park and athletics track. - Junction alterations at the intersection of Edge Lane and the A56 have temporarily reduced vehicle numbers but the overall flow will soon increase significantly, when the extra turning lane being constructed at Stretford starts to reliably feedi more cars onto Edge Lane. Turning right out of Ryebank Road can be difficult and dangerous. Traffic lights and a yellow box junction are needed. Nicolas Road, Newport Road, Oswald Road and Longford Road also struggle to cope with the current volumes of traffic. A new housing development will only add to these problem. - The linked traffic assessment does not uderstood how flow changes throughout the week. - I would recommend most traffic exits towards the Trafford side onto more open roads. - Reinstating a cycle and a pedestrian route across the site is positive move. - If the work goes ahead construction traffic must be directed to avoid some streets and understand there is a part-time, unofficial, one way system, that stops traffic from blocking up Longford Road at school times.

There should be some element of social housing and/or other affordable housing - not just top-end provision of private housing.

This proposal includes plans to enter the development site from Ryebank Rd in Trafford, which is not appropriate as this is a CHORLTON Development. It also includes proposals to open up Ryebank Rd as a through Rd which would be a disaster for the area and create a 'rat run' between the two sides of Ryebank Rd in Manchester and Trafford and completely alter the nature of the local area. On the Trafford side we already cope with high levels of traffic from Manchester United football ground, Lancashire Cricket Ground and the local school on Ryebank Rd. - I completely oppose options 1,2and 3 and have written to Trafford councillors to take action. Trafford residents are being left in the dark about these proposals by Manchester, when we could be adversley affected by these proposals.

I'm not sure we need any more detached houses. I'd rather a more efficient use of space was considered and more houses were built.

This housing needs to be affordable to first time buyers and young people.

It's unlikely that the proposed homes will provide the type of housing required in the local area. There are currently no plans that outline how you will be developing the local infrastructure and services to allow for these new homes. I'd suggest that your main concern is profit over people, community and the environment. -

I live on longford road it can take me up to 5 minutes to be able to get out of my drive due to traffic down the road. - The school children parents operate an voluntary one way system to counter this traffic. - How is this going to support traffic from 70 more houses each morning?

Proposed access point on Longford Rd is already a busy area with school traffic to nearby St. John's Primary. The road is used as a 'cut through' to Chorlton centre. - On street parking that exists on Longford Rd will obstruct drivers' viewpoint on exiting the new development. - Ryebank Rd to the south is already affected by school traffic and traffic which uses the road as a thoroughfare (via Longford, Nicolas and Newport Rds) to access Edge Lane as a means of entry onto the Motorway. There is on street parking on this part of Ryebank Rd which will make entry to the new development more of a challenge. - It is not fit to withstand an increase in traffic. -

I strongly disagree with this development proosal. No local people want it!. My family and I have resided on Longford,Newport and Ryebank for over eighty years.All roads concerned are already rat runs and I can't park outside my property as it is. - I'm sure the people proposing this don't live here,so please respect the wishes of those of us who do and have done all our lives. - The land in question is full of childhood memories to four generations of my family and I know that it provides a habitat to over thirty bird ,plant and other wildlife species including bats and tawny owls.Have some respect for this fact if nothing else.

WE STRONGLY OBJECT to any proposed plans to build on this green open space especially as we were infomed back in 1996 when the MMU tried to sell the land for development that this land was GIVEN to them for RECREATIONAL use only. We would therefore definitely want this green open space to be continued to be used by the local community. We feel also that the traffic/pollution problems already existing in the area are horrendous - especially along Longford Road with it having St. John's and Oswald Road schools and the traffic from Stretford Athletic meetings seems to be increasing massively. The schools, doctors, local hospitals, parking facilities and other local services are already struggling to provide for the community as it is at the moment, so surely planning to increase the population in the area will result in making matters a lot worse.

If this development is to proceed then the vast majority of cars must be forced to leave via Ryebank Road to the north. There is no additional capacity for more cars to leave to the south i.e. via the Longford Road exit. Nicolas, Newport and Longford Roads are already extremely congested and cars drive up and down the roads looking for places to park therefore it is not practical for these roads to become one way due to cars being forced to reverse to find a space to park. The only way this scheme should be allowed to proceed is if the majority of cars exit via the Ryebank Road to the north of the housing estate and not via Longford Road. Do not create a through road as you will create a rat run for cars.

Disgusted that you plan to remove more of our limited green space in Manchester. People live on the fringes of Chorlton precisely because it is green, there are fewer houses and cars. This risks a huge increase in the amount of traffic on both ryebank road and Longford, reduces the more rural feel of the area compared to other parts of south Manchester, will create more noise... all the things we loved about the area and the reason we moved there are being ripped away from us. Deeply, deeply disappointed.

Access should be shared by Ryebank Rd to the north and south. Longford Rd is heavily used and congested and should be made one way. The entrance to the site should be as close to Ryebank Rs as possible and not encroach onto Longford Rd. Serious consideration is needed to cope with the increased car journeys during the very busy school runs presently seen. Longford Rd and Ryebank Rd cannot cope with the current levels of vehicle movements never mind the traffic coming from an additional 70 properties. We assume extra capacity will be required within local schools.

I very concerned about the impact of 70 new homes and possible 150 cars being introduced to an already congested area. - It is a dreadful proposal looking to squeeze a profit from an area that is already saturated with cars and housing. - Kensington Road/ Great Stone Road is already a busy, dangerous traffic nightmare of speeding and congestion. - Longford Road is already a busy congested area especially at school times. - I thoroughly oppose all aspects of this proposal. - Please consider how congested it is to currently drive currently in Chorlton, Stretford and what the impact of another 70 homes and 150 cars would be. - -

The area is already too crowded. This will affect school places, doctors and dentists. There isn't enough resources for the people who live here already. The traffic is awful and the children at Oswald Rd already have enough traffic fumes to breath without having to be next to another building site and 70 new homes (with 140 new cars to accompany them).

Any increase in housing needs to be complemented by an equivalent increase in local services such as schools, doctors, dentists. I do not see any of this in these plans and this is completely inappropriate in terms of locally planning. There is already huge pressure on local school places and health services and this needs to be addressed.

sufficient parking should be included. There is a high density of terraced houses in the area already. There is a much greater need for detached homes rather than terraced or semi-detached.

This space is a place of biodiversity which should be urgently retained (see yesterday's news re. 80 % of insects have died out since 1989). As one of many animals on the planet we need to urgently retain areas of meadow/trees for once they have gone, they have gone. This is particularly applicable in urban areas where insects can thrive without the constant application of pesticides and other chemicals.

It is vital that there is no through route connecting 'North Ryebank Rd' to Longford road in the south to avoid it becoming a 'rat run' and to reduce congestion. - 70 houses is too many for the local infrastructure (especially traffic) to absorb. This will increase traffic flow on Edge Lane which is already quite congested at peak times. Traffic flow on Longford Road is already difficult as it is not wide enough for two-way traffic flow due to the absence of off-street parking and so this can only be worsened by increased traffic to and from the new site - We should retain the wild field as it currently exists to support biodiversity in Manchester (MCC biodiversity strategy states "The aim of the Manchester Biodiversity Strategy is to: Conserve, protect and enhance biodiversity in the City for current and future generations." especially with the dramatic fall in insect numbers occurring in the UK. - The site is also a valued green community resource for local people to enjoy a natural wild space - MCC Green & Blue Strategy states "The natural environment delivers essential 'ecosystem services' including life-support systems such as the recycling of air and water; capturing and storing carbon in peat, woodland and soil; flood protection; and waste purification – along with many others" Developing the Ryebank site would mean losing more of these 'essential 'ecosystem' services' and would be a negative impact on climate change. - Developing this site seems in opposition to the Objectives set out in the Green & Blue Strategy: "In order to realise the city's vision Manchester and its stakeholders will: 1. Improve the quality and function of existing green and blue Infrastructure"...

you are cashing in on the gentrification of areas and not considering the need for affordable housing options. Manchester has less green space than London and you're reducing this further. - More houses = more cars = more pollution. - More houses = more demand on schools and other services and no provision for this.

I am very for these plans (I live on Newport Road) I just hope these houses are affordable (below £500,000) so that actual locals can afford to live here! I would love to move into one!!

This is a terrible idea. Has anyone from the planning driven down Ryebank Road, Longford, Nicolas and Newport roads during rush hour or at school pick-up/drop off times? These are INCREDIBLY congested roads - are you honestly proposing to add to the horrendous traffic and parking by adding 70 more homes? There is no parking. There is no room. It is already dangerous for residents. There simply isn't the level of space needed to accommodate yet more houses. PLUS the secondaries in this area are oversubscribed: these new homes would be outside the Chorlton High catchment - so quite where do you think the children living here will go to secondary? PLUS we have one GP (at Nicolas Road), which again is already stretched to capacity (more so since the Oswald Rd practice closed). All the local NHS dentists are closed to new patients. Before you even consider development you need first to consider traffic, schooling and healthcare - IT IS TOO CONGESTED AND BUSY A LOCATION AND OUR LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE WILL NOT COPE. Please, please don't ruin this part of Chorlton just so MMU can make some quick cash. These are our homes, our community, and we are already struggling.

Houses should be built to a high specification, in keeping with local houses, with spacious hallways and wide stairwells. 3, 4 and 5 bedroom properties should be considered whilst additional space should be considered for smaller housing that wants to expand in the future. - - My preference would be to have tree-lined streets with off street parking, similar to those found on and around Claude Road. - - Perhaps you could use a home builder that would provide an option for some customisation for those that provide an early deposit. - - We should try not make this into a through road for traffic unless there is evidence that easing the traffic that is going through Oswald Road would be beneficial to the community, some analysis on this would be needed.

I don't think building should be allowed on this greenfield site. We have little enough of it as it is. Build on brownfield sites instead.

I thought developers were supposed to provide a certain percentage of affordable housing. Do the proposals take this into a/c? - - Has consideration been given to the impact on Longford Park? Some of its facilities (such as litter, dog poo bins, and play areas are already overstretched) and parts of the park are run down. Can the developers be required to provide extra facilities and or upgrade existing facilities as a condition of being granted planning permission? - - Will local schools be able to cope with extra demand for places? - - Has the safety of children from St. John's been taken into account?

This consultation is a sham. Where are all the reject options? Fundamentally we DO NOT want this redevelopment. The only excusable building that might be worth considering is rentable social housing with subsidized rents. None of the proposals qualify in this criteria. In any case residents have already gone through the trauma of the Oswald Rd Primary School rebuild. They were told a pack of lies by their councilors about this. The disturbances have been immense and have not ended once the build was completed - the school is now running a market and live music venue on Saturdays. Given the untrustworthiness of the council and local councilors and the fact that none of this was put before the electorate in a manifesto, we totally reject this proposal.

Single vehicular access to the development - from Longford Rd only - would help minimise house burglaries.

Don't over develop the site

The proposed 70 homes will provide much needed accommodation in the area. What about school places for the children who may move in? St Johns, Oswald road and Chorlton C of E are already over subscribed. Will the council be publically addressing this point?

This should not be built. - - 3,4 and 5 bed homes are going to have lets say a minimum of 2 children so thats another 140 odd children that need educating and almost all schools in Chorlton are over subscribed. There appears to be no provision for an extra school being built so that seems really bad planning. What are your plans for this? You would have to build an extra school.

Traffic management is a huge issue. If there is no vehicle access from Rye Bank road, it increases the flow of traffic through Oswald Road and Longford Road, this roads are already unmanageable at busy periods due to Oswald Road and St John's primary school traffic. Linking Rye Bank road fully would ease the problem, creating a much better traffic flow, and meaning a lot of traffic could avoid having pass the schools. Not linking would enhance the problem, as 70 family homes means a huge amount of vehicles and journeys.

With a mix of 3,4,5 bedroom homes - how affordable are these - 70 houses feels v dense - one access via longford Rd puts a lot of pressure on narrow roads with 2'schjols nearby

Our major concern is the volume of traffic running through Ryebank Road/Longford Road as the sole entrance to the new development and therefore both the north & south entrance to Ryebank Road should be used with no through road. Furthermore the density of housing should be reduced to 10 per hectare. - - A major concern is the amount of heavy construction vehicles that will be passing through Ryebank Rd during the construction period which we assume will be for 2+ years and would want to see what plans are being put in place for this period.

Local Services Issues: - I'd rather the area were left as it is until local services/infrastructure can cope with the current population. There are not enough school places for kids in the area as it is and it should be noted that the proposed houses are outside the current catchment area for Chorlton High School. Similarly no-one in the area can get a doctors appointment in less than 2 to 3 weeks and I've been on the local dentist waiting list for 8 years now. Where are the required additional public services to support the additional population going to come from? - - Environment: - On the environmental side, the site is also the only place I know in the area that has populations of Marsh Orchids (*Dactylorhiza* spp.) which really should be protected. I can provide photographs of these if required. - - Traffic congestion in streets to South: - The congestion on Longford, Ryebank (South), Newport and Nicolas Roads is already a problem especially at School opening/closing time and when there are Athletic events in Longford Park.. The primary exit for any development should be to the North toward Great Stone Road where there is less of a bottleneck for traffic. I'm sure the developers would not appreciate having to market their luxury houses as being in Firswood rather than Chorlton but that is no excuse to make life worse for existing residents to the south of the proposed development who already often struggle to get out of these streets in motor vehicles.

Arguably my family are the residents most effected by this potential development. My land adjoins the proposed development site and a cul-de-sac that you are threatening to turn into a through road. I could not be more upset about this if I tried. - - I am opposed to the development of this land which has long been part of the community's green space. I grew up in Chorlton, first living on Copley Road, I attended St John's RC school (also adjoining the proposed development site). I have used Rye Bank fields my whole life to walk through and to enjoy. When we had the chance to buy our first family home right next to the land, I could not have been happier. We enjoy privacy on that side of our home, we enjoy the sound of the wind as it blows through the trees just over the fence from our garden, we enjoy the beautiful and sometimes rarely seen little birds that come from the trees to eat bird seed in our garden, we enjoy the safety the area provides for our child and our two cats, we enjoy the good air quality provided by the trees and plants. - - Not only does this potential development threaten to take away all these very good things from us, it now threatens the status of our road as a cul-de-sac which it has been for many years. This would have a massive impact on our quality of life and the safety of my family. This is outrageous and comes as quite a shock to me, and I gather to Trafford councillors who had absolutely no knowledge of this when I contacted them. How can you think it acceptable to make plans that have such a massive impact on my home and community without the input of those who represent my interests? This is despicable! Now, I could accept that you had not consulted Trafford on your plans for Rye Bank Fields as this land sits within MCC's area but threatening to turn my lovely quite cul-de-sac into a busy through road without consulting Trafford Council is to deny me and my community the representation that we, not just deserve, but are absolutely entitled to. - - Having access from the Trafford side would have a detrimental impact on the quality of life enjoyed by the residents of Rye Bank Road and would have a huge impact on the safety of residents and road users around Greatstone Road and Kensington Road. I have personally witnessed two car crashes at the junction of Kensington Road and Manchester Road in the last year and countless near misses. Sitting outside the bars and cafes nearby is not really very relaxing, instead it is rather tense with car horns beeping loudly and many dangerous incidents. Increasing traffic at that junction, as this development undoubtedly would, would be detrimental to safety. Greatstone Road is already such a busy road that it is difficult to cross at rush hour. - - I am also very confused by the consultation document which is not at all clear. On page 5, you note that there is a tree priority zone, then later you clearly show this area with houses built on it. This signals to me that while to claim to be interested in preserving the important trees on this site, you can not actually be trusted to do so. Further, those incredibly crude diagrams showing different 'concept layouts' are not very helpful as they are just not clear enough and when compared to the 'illustrative development' drawing, there are important differences such as 'concept layout 2' shows road access from Trafford into the site and 'illustrative development framework option 2' clearly shows that there is no road access from Trafford. It is unfair of you to produce such a shoddy, unfinished and contradictory document for this consultation. As a community we deserve more thought than this. - - It states in the consultation document that the development will provide a 'great place to live'. You must be aware that a great place to live is somewhere with capacity and amenities? Well Chorlton barely has capacity for those currently living there. The streets are crammed with cars making driving anywhere in Chorlton an utter headache. The GP practices are so stretched that a 4 week wait for a non-urgent appointment is to be expected. There are not enough primary school places for the children already in the area. Stretching these further is going to have a negative impact for the whole community. - - I am absolutely heartbroken about these plans, I could not bare to see those trees which provide us with enjoyment and privacy be removed from just beside our garden. I could not stand to see development right up to the park where old trees currently stand. I will not stand for our road being made into a through road. - - I am concerned about the potential for increased flooding in our area as currently, Rye Bank Fields become saturated in water after heavy rain and clearly take a lot of the burden from the surrounding area. - - Finally, I understand that Rye Bank Fields was actually gifted to MMU by possibly a previous incarnation of MCC. I find it astounding that they can be allowed profit from it at all. If this is true, I am disgusted at MMU. - -

We live on Rye Bank Road in Trafford, or Rye Bank Road North as you call it. We are extremely annoyed at the suggestion that any form of vehicular access via our road is being proposed, We are further incensed that NO consultation regarding these proposals has been discussed with either the Trafford residents of this road or Trafford Council!! We know that this is the case re the latter as we have contacted our local councillors who have had no response from Manchester regarding these proposals at the time of writing. - - Plans to build on this land have been rejected in the past because of the issue of access. On the Manchester side of the field the traffic is probably even more congested than previously. No doubt the residents on that side will feedback their views. We are vehemently opposed to any increase in traffic on the Trafford side of the field and will be making sure our elected representatives are aware of the strength of feeling.

Keep it as open space

There is no indication that homes will be affordable within the realm of an average wage earner. There should be options for those on low incomes to live in this estate.

Agree with the need for housing on this under used site but 15 units per hectare can't be the local density given the terrace houses around. This scheme needs to be higher density and have more 2, 3 and some 4 bed semi and terraced dwellings that help starter families. Not large detached dwellings that take up too much scarce land and not help the housing market. - Only agree with shared road if proper cycle facilities not just a dash of white paint. - Agree need to avoid this been a car cut through for the local school. No through access for cars. -

Vehicular access, especially from Longford Road, requires very careful consideration. The existing access is very close to Longford Road's junction with Ryebank Road , which forces motorists to make a 90 degree turn and includes blind spots. At present, vehicles park on both sides of Longford Road and Ryebank Road near to their junction. This development will probably result in a minimum of 70 additional vehicles, and possibly in excess of 200, having to negotiate this junction. Could the access road not be sited further along Longford Road towards the school -- or install traffic lights or priority to oncoming vehicles in one direction.

Large executive homes are not what is required in Chorlton. The main demand is for more affordable three bedroom homes. I would be interested to know what S106 contributions would be made towards the provision of much needed affordable housing in Chorlton.

Traffic on Longford road is already an issue. A one way system had been proposed. Or limiting parking to just one side of the road. - This would need to be dealt with. - Just 2 story semi detached buildings would be my preference. Not 3 story townhouse style. - -

Why have no residents of Stretford been informed of this consultation given the potential devastating impact on them? - - There is already too much traffic in Chorlton and Stretford. - We do not want this development.

I cannot comment on most of the previous questions regarding the proposal because it is inherently wrong for the following reasons: - 1. Traffic congestion on Nicolas Road, Longford Road, and Newport Road and also on both sections of Ryebank Road is already overwhelming because of the necessity of on-street parking. There is no way in which the proposed development could be reached without using these roads - thus the area would be gridlocked. - 2.. I understand that Ryebank Fields is set aside for "recreatiional/sporting" use by the community - it is not a piece of waste land but an area vital to the open green-ness of this part of Chorlton which is surrounded by houses, and as such is regularly used by a huge number of local residents.Housing development is not community use. - 3. Yes, there is a massive housing need but this is not the place for it. One has only to take the tram from Chorlton to Rochdale and one can immediately identify areas of truly waste land where housing needs to be built not only to meet local need but also to enhance the local environment. What's more, none of the houses in this proposed development are affordable.I appreciate those areas are not owned by MMU but it still remains that this proposed housing development is in the wrong place. - 4. It is wrong that these proposals have been put forward on the basis of commenting on an end result (ie that development will proceed) rather than first of all commenting on whether it is right that it should go ahead.

Your survey is inadequately designed. All questions after the first few assume agreement with the development so the results of subsequent questions are worthless. The diagrams describing the four options for vehicular access are so badly drawn they are impossible to understand. Why, if access from Rye Bank Rd is being considered, are no consultation meetings scheduled to take place in Trafford?

I would strongly oppose a development that linked ryebank and longford road. This development should provide access and exit only for residents. The impact of opening up/ giving a through road would have a negative effect on the highways especially on man united home matches. Many local residents would be effected from a highways perspective and access would be dangerous on foot to longford park if there was a through road. - thumbs up to the development but i hope the highways officer appointed to this scheme is strong enough to go with a highways proposal that is for access and exit only for residents and not one which allows a cut through for cars. - - I also hope the drainage strategy doesnt allow for swales or other SUDS. the developer only ever proposes these as a cost saving exercise to them. Get a big attenuation tank in the proposal and ensure the site has good drainage. - -

You have not informed Trafford Council of your proposals. - You are proposing to divert additional traffic through Stretford without consulting Trafford Council. - You have not identified how you will accommodate the Thirlmere Aqueduct. - This gifted land should be returned to MCC for the access and enjoyment of the local residents.

This is a highly congested area. Longford Road and nearby Nicholas Road are heavily populated,narrow streets which are virtually inaccessible due to residents cars and'the traffic caused by parental access to the two local schools. The last thing this area needs is a further traffic problem,

This survey is geared toward only people who agree that this site should be developed. This site should be left alone to be enjoyed and used by the wild life and people who have been using it for many years. Your approach with this survey lacks real choice and attempts to coerce people into your way of thinking. It is not a robust way of collecting meaningful data. I do not want to see any of your four "choices" applied to Ryebank Fields. I want to see them left to be enjoyed by the local people who have used them for leisure purposes for many years.

There should be smaller houses too

No vehicles enter ryebank road stretford side.

This is an inappropriate planning proposal which would incur the loss of a unique rural space used and loved by the local residents.

Why is there no provision for homes for older people...and affordable homes a more mixed demographic....Manchester is supposed to be age friendly....family homes...yes. Executive homes...no! The word executive means nothing but an excuse to put the price up.

This particular feedback form is not fit for purpose. The diagrams are of substandard quality and the questions which ask specifics about street planning and layout of the whole development are not appropriate for the public to comment on, however educated they may be. In no part of the survey are local residents asked how they feel a new development will impact on them and their families. As a resident of the Longford Road area, I am very aware that a new development will impact significantly on the "through traffic" along Longford Road, which is already used as a short cut by many vehicles particularly at rush hour. The development will also remove a much-loved and well-used green space which is a thriving ecological environment.

Why no social housing?!?! - Trying to keep Chorlton solely middle class as always

This is a ridiculous proposal . On a road where there are two schools and a problem with traffic. So 70 "luxury " homes . Do we need luxury homes . We don't but the developer does . This would mean at least another 150 cars on that road and on Chorlton roads . That road is already used as a cut through from both ends . . Those fields should be left alone . It has natural biodiversity . I lived on the corner of Ryebank and Longford and we campaigned to stop this land from being built upon . - Then there is the stress on the local services . Schools for instance . The whole thing is outrageous .

Longford Rd is already heavily congested. Building homes that front on to Longford Road will not only remove the trees that afford a gradual phasing in of the landscape of Longford Park, but would reduce areas for present residents to park cars, reduce parking spaces for those dropping and picking up children from the schools, require residents who are leaving or entering their homes to drive across footpaths on which school children are walking. The trees that line Longford Rd on one side afford a graduated move into the landscape of Longford Park from the school fields. The 'fencing' in of the streetscape by building houses will not only throw up an architectural mismatch (no houses on Longford rd have off street parking) but runs contrary to the design principles as they will not reflect the housing stock in situ. The terraced houses of Longford Rd are not present in this part of the road, three storey houses will dominate the semi detached properties opposite. - Any vehicular access into the new development should follow the present car park access by the sub station: any movement into Longford Rd of this junction will create further congestion, remove parking spots and endanger health and safety of road users and pedestrians. Longford road needs to become a one way street from its junction with Oswald Rd down to Ryebank Rd. If the fields are called Ryebank Fields, it stands that access to them should be from both ends of Ryebank Rd

Ryebank Fields were given to the people of Manchester for recreational use and so they have been used for many years. The Council and MMU have no right to destroy this wild space which is widely used by local people, add to already severe traffic congestion and add yet more to our carbon emissions. The whole project is designed to simply make profit for fat cats and has nothing whatsoever to do with solving a housing crisis. Does anyone really think that poor people will be able to buy these homes?

We feel that the existing road infrastructure cannot adequately support the increased traffic generated by the proposed development, particularly if road access is only from the Longford Road side. - - Due to on-road parking Ryebank Road is effectively single-lane. This is especially the case when events are held at the Longford Road Stadium. St John's School creates significant congestion during drop-off and pick-up times. This cannot be avoided by encouraging pupils to walk since it is a faith school with a wide catchment area. Adding 70+ cars at peak times would not only add to this congestion but have a knock-on effect on surrounding roads. - - We would be opposed to the imposition of a one-way traffic system, if this is proposed.

I was under the impression that this land was gifted for sport and leisure use, building houses is not leisure use. If the development does go ahead then the density of the housing should be lower and there should only be traffic access from Longford road to keep increase in through traffic to a minimum.

Feel very strongly that this is an opportunity to create housing with a strong environmental impact and modern architecture. They should respond to the culture associated with Chorlton and not mirror local housing styles in a mock way. They should be able to create their own electricity with solar panels etc. This is an opportunity to do something radical and modern which is much more in keeping with Chorlton and Manchester than a simple housing estate. Any attempt to do anything but this is falling short on what is a progressive area and city.

1. THERE IS NO MENTION OF GROUND CONDITIONS IN THE PROPOSALS. ARE THEY A PROBLEM OR NOT?
- 2. THE DENSITY IS TOO LOW. IT IS A WASTE OF PRECIOUS HOUSING LAND. - 3. THERE SHOULD BE A SUBSTANTIAL SOCIAL HOUSING ELEMENT. - 4. AS CURRENTLY PROPOSED THE CHARACTER OF THE SURROUNDING HOUSING IS NOT RESPECTED. THE PROPOSED DENSITY IS TOO LOW FOR THAT. - -

This development will be detrimental to the area. You are gentrifying an area and ,making it non-affordable for the majority. The traffic around this area leading up to Chester Road is a nightmare and 70 extra homes being in this same spot will make it a lot worse. STOP BEING GREEDY AND RUINING THE AREA I WAS BORN IN AND AM SLOWLY WATCHING BECOME SOUTH MANCHESTER'S ANSWER TO HALE. THIS IS NOT CHESHIRE!!!!

This is a terrible development. There is very little green space in chorlton - one school has no green space at all! Removing green space from this area is disgraceful. There is an abundance of green space in Sale and out towards Cheshire. Houses should be built there. Chorlton already has too few schools (primary and high school), doctors surgeries, dentists - how will extra school places and other facilities be created? Traffic on Longford road is already terrible due to the two primary schools on the road, an additional 70 houses (140 cars) will be unbeatable. The other developments of chorlton are excellent and will really improve the area. This will rob the area of space. MMU should be ashamed of themselves and the council should think about the long term future of chorlton not theirs (and MMUs) short term capital gain.

The questions here are highly loaded in favour of the overall opinion it is clear the developers wish to project. I have responded to this survey as a resident of Longford Road to make my view clear that a single point of access from the corner of Longford Road and Ryebank Road would be completely unacceptable for a development of this size. - - I am not against development of the site in principle as the the fields are currently quite an eyesore. However the council must recognise the fact that Longford Road and surrounding areas are already extremely congested and at least twice a day during the school runs vehicular access is nigh on impossible. A single point of access from Longford Road adding potentially a further 140 cars a day trying to get out onto Oswald Road and Edge Lane would be intolerable and detrimental to current homeowners. - - Two points of access, one from Longford Road and one from Ryebank Road to the North would be the only way I as a resident of Longford Road could support this development and only if the two halves of the estate were separated to split the traffic from the northern and southern access points. - - Any other scheme I would have no choice but to object to in the strongest possible terms.

I am not against new housing developments in this area but I am concerned about the increased traffic that would result along the southern Ryebank Road, particularly if the option with only one access road from the south is taken forward (I see no reason for this option to be chosen apart from a desire to maximise profit). The work should not go ahead without a detailed proposal for what will be done to improve the situation on Ryebank Road and neighbouring roads, particularly at the dangerous junction with Edge Lane (traffic lights there are surely long overdue at the very least). It is vital that these issues are dealt with in a holistic manner which includes mitigation of traffic and parking problems caused by events at Longford Park stadium and the expansion of Oswald Road School.

Don't plant more trees. Eventually they grow too big and cut out too much light. Preserve existing trees - - Option 4 is the best bit to have a through road. Why not propose a through Road? Seems stupid to me

CHORLTON IS IN DESPERATE NEED OF NEW HOUSING AND THIS SEEMS TO BE A PERFECT OPPORTUNITY FOR ACHIEVING THIS WITHOUT DAMAGING THE ENVIRONMENT OR THE PARK AREA

I entirely disagree with these houses being aimed at 'executives'. If the desire is to build 'much needed homes' they should be available and marketed to everyone, at a reasonable price, affordable by those on low wages. Elitism is already rife in Chorlton and the area doesn't need any more of that. 'Much needed' clearly means 'high income generating' in this case and I do not support that. - - Creating congestion on surrounded roads in order to have a single entrance and 'maximise value' is also a nonsense, wrong and completely exploitative of the people who may want to live there. I don't support that in any way and wish this to be heard. - - Chorlton needs to be kept beautiful individual and available to everyone. Everyone!!!

As a resident we have huge issues with traffic due to the 2 schools in the immediate vicinity. It's hard enough to park outside our own homes as it is, traffic is a big problem. Often Longford Rd to Ryebank is used as a cut though by many drivers at peak times of the day so I have concerns about safety of my children and others in their day to day lives. It is my understanding that the land was gifted to the university in the 50's but there was a covenant to say it could only ever be used for recreational use. There is a huge amount of wildlife which will be lost if this land is developed. However, my main concern is the pressure it will put on the community resources... will there be another doctors surgery or dentist opened to meet the demand of all these extra homes? It's already very difficult to get an appointment within a reasonable time frame. Schools around here are highly over subscribed and have been extended to meet the demands but I can't see how they can make them any bigger?! All in all, I have great concerns about this development and how it will impact our local community.

I support the building of new much-needed homes in Chorlton. I would not support just one entry point at the end of Longford Road - I think there should be access from Ryebank road as well. Longford Road is chiefly a residential street that is already blocked by traffic especially when parents are dropping off/picking up children from St John's Sschool. That said, I would not want the new estate to become a 'rat run'. - - I am aware that the area of Longford Park new the proposed new houses, is very wet and gets waterlogged on a regular basis. I've also been told by people living in the houses on Ryebank Road that their houses are very damp and their basements frequently flood. Great care would need to be taken with the building of these new houses to ensure they're not prone to damp, and that the situation isn't made worse for existing residents on Ryebank Road.

This is the most outrageous money making scheme I have seen in ages. There is no basis on which I would agree or contemplate an increase of traffic flow down Ryebank, Nicolas, Newport or Longford Rd. - I have been resident here for 4 years. The traffic flow has got worse and worse particularly at school run times, Saturday morning park run and Longford park events generally clog up the streets. People park up, ignore white-lines and dropped kerbs already so they can drop children off or take part in 5k runs around the park. - - Social media is turning this into a Trafford Vs Chorlton fist fight over access. This is a very important issue but what about- - GP services, it is impossible to get an appointment to see a GP unless on death-bed at Chorlton Family Health Centre which would be the nearest practice . - - Schools for the children as these properties will more likely be families. All wanting out at school run time. The junction of Longford and Ryebank would be completely congested. Quite often I have to queue to get out of Nicolas too. - - Shops, given the precinct is likely to be closed down at the same time. - - Access for HGVs during building. Damage to roads. Would guarantees be given about no HGVS trundling down Nicolas, Longford and Newport. At the moment on these streets people don't park on pavements but I am sure they will start doing once HGVs are a daily occurrence. - - Why should some sort of traffic management people be enforced on the residents of these streets just to accommodate a high-end luxury development which is not providing well needed homes as they will be unaffordable to the average person in Chorlton. Also when the development took place on Edge Lane the builders were completely inconsiderate with lots of traffic hold-ups whilst HGVs accessed the site or off-loaded. However if as I fear this development will be forced on residents then I would be in favour of resident only parking for the duration of the development to stop all the contractors clogging up the surrounding streets with white vans. - - If it goes ahead then I believe that vehicle access should be on both sides of Ryebank road. The Trafford side is much less congested currently than the Manchester side. - - If a development is required I would actually prefer to see an eco friendly development with some vision. No car Zone for example with Eco houses. A GP surgery/Dentist on site. Ultimately however I believe residents do not need the stress that this development will bring - -

I'd like to see these homes become affordable to young couples who are not necessarily on high earnings. I see issues with investors just buying them up and no one local being able to afford them, which I think is counterproductive to the community development of the area. I personally love the sound of the development and would be interested, but I'd like to see a chance to actually get involved instead of foreign investors purchasing for net yields...and never living there. Where can I find out more about this project? - - Good luck with the development!

It is already an absolute nightmare to try to drive on the roads off Ryebank - I live on Newport Road and in the morning and afternoon/evening because of the schools and athletic field traffic it is often impossible to get to my house. The amount of road rage I have witnessed around the school on Longford road and Oswald is incredible, so any increased traffic created due to a development will only cause this situation to deteriorate. - It will end in a disaster I am sure of it.

If MMU want to sell this land on then they should give it to the council in the same way that the council gave them Birley fields. Chorlton does not need further development nor further homes. I have worked for MMU previously. They have enough in offshore bank accounts to keep them going and don't need more money from building on green land. Leave the fields alone and also, stop proposing to increase traffic to Trafford when this entire development has nothing to do with them

One entrance/exit is a very poor solution to access given the current situation with Nicolas Longford and Newport Roads all running into Ryebank road with no other access points.

Do not want to lose an area of greenery. If the plans go ahead, worried about increased through traffic at peak times.

As a resident of Nicolas Road, this area simply can not accommodate any more traffic. In addition to the high volume of vehicles using Nicolas Road, Newport Road, and Longford Road as 'cut throughs', many of which travel at speeds in excess of 30mph despite the 20mph limit, there are increasingly frequent problems with vehicles parking across driveways. Turning left or right onto Ryebank Road is dangerous due to limited visibility caused by the volume of vehicles parked on either side. Finally turning out of Ryebank Road onto Edge Lane can already take 5 minutes during peak traffic times - this would increase significantly with the volume of vehicles 70 new homes would bring. Whilst obviously inconvenient, the greater concern is safety with many children/pets in the area - we need to be reducing the volume of traffic on these streets at current levels, never mind with an additional 70 homes.

I am deeply concerned by the plans to only design the new development with vehicle access from Longford Rd. As a resident of Newport Rd, I can tell you now that traffic down these streets is already overly busy. We suffer from cars speeding through using the road as a cut through to Stretford. I have written to the council before about this. By only designing a single entry, you are penalising the residents of Ryebank, Longford, Newport and Nicholas Rd due to the huge increase in traffic. It's a terrible idea considering how bad it already gets. It will almost certainly lead to an accident and puts children's and pet's lives at risk. Please seriously consider the two entrance plans for the development. I have no other objections to the plans.

Have a through road and create some smaller and/or affordable units. Do everything possible to make them attractive to first time buyers and owner occupiers.

The same people that are shouting against this site are on other platforms complaining about housing and the area in general. They simply cannot be happy either way and so MMU, our council and our residents should not lose out yet again.

I think it is an appalling idea to build new homes on this green field site. The site was given to MMU for recreational purposes. Any future use of the site should solely be for this reason. I am shocked that in this age of rapid global warming, loss of natural habitats and reducing bee populations that it would be considered prudent to build new homes on a green field site. This is an area of natural beauty. The council is being incredibly short sighted if it thinks this is a prudent development. Once all the homes are full and the population increases again then the next move could be to start eating into the green belt, sell more school playing fields, maybe build on some parts of Longford Park until there is no greenery left.

Chorlton is already densely populated. Edge Lane is crowded every morning and this development could see over 200 more cars going in and out of the area. If every house had 2 or 3 cars this would make the whole area impassable at night and in the morning. Parking would become even more problematic.

There is no way that anymore traffic can be accommodated from Ryebank Road...Why is one of the pictures shown not an option just to be accessed from the Trafford side a much bigger road and more naturally able to take this amount of traffic. The traffic on Ryebank Road Chorlton is already ridiculous with two schools at either end of the leading roads and then the sports centre. If you are to develop the site the traffic must come from Trafford end and be closed off at the Chorlton end ...this would cause complete chaos on already ridiculously unpassable roads during busy times....chaos will happen and road rage and damage is inevitable...if you must do it do it from Trafford and sealed at Chorlton side with no access except into the park...your a and b drawings are the same..what options are you actually giving?

There should be social housing here if anything

My main issue is around the proposal for a single access. I live on the corner of Newport Road and Longford Road and already have an issue with speeding traffic and traffic congestion at school start and school end times. Additional traffic, particularly at these times will make the situation a whole lot worse. The more access points through the new estate the better although I fully support the idea of no through road to stop this becoming a rat run, again particularly at peak periods.

Chorlton is packed as it is and doesn't need any more housing. If anything, existing residents need the few green spaces we have left. This project is merely a money making scheme by the City Council, and as such not helping anybody in Chorlton, but only making life more difficult for those already living here, what with additional traffic, an already general lack of parking, high pollution and noise levels, etc.

As I object to any development on this land this consultation form gives no option to state this; agreement is assumed. - The roads in this area are already problematic and any increase in traffic flow would add significant risk of harm to residents especially children considering the close proximity to schools. - The schools in Chorlton are already over subscribed and additional housing in the area - aimed at families- would further add to this problem. - The GP's and dentists in the area are under significant pressure especially since losing the Oswald Road Medical Practice and again adding more residents will further exacerbate this problem. - Finally the loss of green space is simply unacceptable. Considering the problems the UK has in meeting emission targets and air quality the loss of this space - which includes mature trees - shows that developed/ local councils simply do not take this issue seriously despite the fact that air quality is a factor in many early deaths. What research is being done to assess how the loss of this green space will impact upon air quality? - Then there is the issue of impact upon biodiversity, recent international reports have highlighted this issue particularly in respect to insects - there is no indication that a full ecological survey is to be conducted prior to development. - I do appreciate that there is a nationwide housing shortage but I strongly believe that other options such as repossessing empty/unfit homes, building on brownfield sites/turning empty shop units into homes should be a priority rather than MMU seeking to make a 'quick buck' from selling the land, which I believe was bequeathed to them for use as an outside space.

My main issue is the parking and traffic this will cause. I live on Longford Road and the parking is absolutely horrendous not only at normal school times but also 4.15-4.45, and 5.15-5.45 due to activities taking place after school it seems. Having only one entrance to the development area is absurd and will cause more issues to roads around the area who already have limited parking

What is needed in Chorlton is affordable social housing for local residents, not expensive 4-5 bed private housing. Also needed is retirement/sheltered housing for local senior citizens. - Will these properties be available to purchase by overseas investors? - Insufficient attention paid to traffic congestion and local parking which is a major problem in Chorlton. Any housing will have very many service/delivery vehicles as well as those of residents which will cause further congestion in surrounding roads - especially onto Edge Lane.

There are too many people and cars in Chorlton already. No additional infrastructure will accompany the building. The surrounding roads will have to bear the additional traffic. Doctor's surgeries are closing whilst the population of Chorlton increases. If you are going to build houses in Chorlton why don't you build places for older people who want to downsize instead of continuing to live two people to a five bedroomed house. Some of us would like to stay in Chorlton where we had lived for forty years but more to smaller residences thus freeing up good quality large houses. The public think that the motive for development is profit not social wellbeing. Builders and planners are viewed with equal suspicion and hide behind platitudes like we need more houses. We may need to house more people but that doesn't mean building new 3 bedroomed town houses that ordinary people can't afford. Furthermore, nobody believes in these "consultations" - they are perceived to be a box ticking exercise. The plans will go ahead anyway. We all know that.

What about the potential 70+ extra cars in an already congested Chorlton/Stretford. - Completely oppose these plans.

As a parent of children at St John's school and a local resident I think that the proposed plans will cause an even bigger problem with air pollution and congestion Monday-Friday with the increase in through traffic and at weekends with Manchester United parking opportunities. The RyeBank Road/Longford Road junction is already very busy and with it being a slightly 'blind' junction the added danger for cars pulling out of/into a new access point is a cause for concern.

Disappointing that no mention of affordable housing and that the emphasis is on 3-5 bed properties that will be out of reach of first time buyers, instead of a mix of 1-3/4 bed properties. - - A single access point would be silly bearing in mind the additional traffic the extra properties will bring and the width of Ryebank Road

Currently motorists fail to observe speed limits. Any development should take into account the need to reduce traffic speeds and volume, as parking is an issue on the chorlton side of ryebank road. Also tree management is very important. Having had a tree fall into our garden (a 30ft lime, no less) from Longford park I am concerned that an effective and enforced tree management programme is in place.

1. As this site has a history of failed development proposals and the main issue is access and traffic in the surrounding streets, it is naive and misleading not to attempt to suggest solutions to the inevitable increases which this development will produce. A development here will make the current traffic chaos of these streets (especially Longford Road) much worse at peak times and no proposals can be considered without clear ideas about how to mitigate this. A one way system will not be popular with some but is the only real way to do so and would allow serious investments in the streets to create traffic calming, more organised car parking and more opportunities for tree planting. - 2. The principle of a suburban enclave for 'executive homes' in this location is fundamentally the wrong approach. These homes will have 2-3 cars apiece and 140-210 new vehicles in the area would be a disaster apart from the inevitable impact on the 'green' frontages currently indicated, which will all quickly become hard surfaced drives. The options suggest that a range of possibilities have been explored when in fact these are just different arrangements of the same thing. Other options might include: A denser development on a smaller area of the site, leaving 50% still green OR leaving a large area which could be excavated to create a retention pond which would help drain the very boggy surrounding areas and become a haven for wildlife; A much higher percentage of social housing mixed with private rented accommodation; a mix of 4 storey apartment blocks with terraces and semis, etc. We are being presented with options to choose between but the really key decisions have already been taken it appears and are market driven! - 3. This is Chorlton and this site is absolutely unique. It is an opportunity to do something brave and interesting which could build on the developing character of the area. How about a Car-free community? Or one which shares a car-pool? If there is one place in Manchester where this could really work it is Chorlton. Good networks of cycle paths and footpaths to connect to the tram and bus routes would be plenty. There are plenty of examples of such places in Germany, Holland and Denmark...why not here? It would be a coup for Manchester and for MMU. Why is MMU promoting a privileged enclave of expensive, privately owned executive homes? - 4. Finally, coming back to my first point, whatever happens here it is vital to invest in the streets on either side of the development (and the school grounds adjacent). Like most of Manchester's streets these are a mess, with pavements that are rutted, cracked, flood regularly (because the roads are resurfaced without removing the under layers) and have pathetic specimens of trees planted appallingly badly in them most of which are not growing and never will because of the conditions in which they have been planted. If a development like this is to happen the impacts on local residents will be huge and the least that should be done in return is to invest seriously in the street and public realm of the surrounding area. -

There should not be any vehicular access onto Longford Road. The road is already over crowded and there are constant jams during school dropping off and picking up hours. The roads to the North (Trafford) are much wider and able to cope with the additional traffic that will be created. - - If you really care about Chorlton and the people that live close to the development rather than just going with the access option that will maximise your profit then you need to ensure that there is no additional traffic (which will lead to further chaos) on Longford Road and the surrounding roads. - - Also, rather than more executive homes i think you should be looking to provide more starter homes and affordable properties. - - Finally has any consideration been given to the public services within Chorlton which are already under strain - school places, doctors, dentists etc. This development along with the proposed residential units at the shopping centre and the leisure centre are going to put a massive strain on Chorlton's public services and road network, which are already struggling and over crowded.

Why is there no mention of making any of these houses affordable? What if 5% of all new developments were mandated to be affordable housing? Wouldn't that create a more diverse neighbourhood? Who says Chorlton needs to be more like the "southern" neighbourhoods. - - Is this really the best use of this site? Does Chorlton need 70 more unaffordable houses? Who are the proposed houses going to be marketed towards? Does the surrounding area need 70+ more vehicles added to the already congested area?

Please, do connect the southern and the northern parts of Rye Bank Road. This is simply vital and it was clearly meant to be a single road. My family lives on Rye Bank Road in Trafford and we desperately need direct access to the Chorlton side for children's school and all other activities which take place mainly in the park. The access can be either car or pedestrian, but please, do make it secure and well lit. We really need to access Longford park securely even during the dark part of the year (children will join the scout group in the park) and if the two parts of the road get connected it will provide a solution of the big problem for many local residents.

I fully object to the proposals and strongly feel that this area should be left as it is. This area is full of wildlife which would obviously suffer if this development to go ahead. Further it would be a huge detriment to the local area to lose such a natural space. The area is popular with walkers, children and dog walkers who would lose a place to connect with nature. - Also with so many people moving into the area the local population will increase - this will have an impact on local schools (all of which are currently over subscribed). Further, an extra 70 houses will increase traffic significantly - particularly along Longford Road which is already overly congested currently due to the schools in the area.

I do not think the buildings should be higher than two storey, so as to match surrounding properties. - - I have concerns about three storey properties being built facing existing properties on Longford road, and blocking existing light. - - I also think the existing tree line on Longford road should be kept, and the proposed development should be self contained. - - I also have major concerns about the existing and future traffic levels on Longford road and surrounding roads. Consideration should be given to implementing a one way system in order to minimise air pollution and keep the traffic moving freely especially during school pick up and drop off times. - - Has consideration been given to the pressures on the current infrastructure of the area, I.e. School places, doctors, dentists, etc. Which will all be under pressure from the expected increase in population.

It is clear that for commercial reasons (property prices) that the preference is to not open the whole development, or one side of the development to Rye Bank Lane. A consequence of this would be no road or limited access to the A56 via the North of the development, without going via the traffic bottle neck that is Edge Lane (aka the A5145/A56 junction)? This would cause local traffic issues. - - With reference to traffic, no information has been provided to indicate that any serious thought has been given as to how the development will impact traffic in local roads, primarily Longford, Newport, Nicolas, Oswald, Ryebank Road and subsequently Edge Lane at peak and non-peak use. - - St Johns RC Primary School has a wide catchment area. As a consequence there is a significant increase in traffic volume from 8:30-9am and 15:15-15:45 during the school term on Longford Road and Ryebank Road. - - Perhaps a well implemented traffic management system could alleviate the impact of the new development during these times of peak use. However thought needs to be given as to how any new traffic management system will impact local residents when the local roads are quiet (non-peak). A one way system may be required at peak use, but not 95% of the time when local roads are quiet. - - The quality of life of existing local resident could be reduced by a poorly implemented system. - - Parking provision; again little consideration appears to have been given to how the increased housing and hence more parked vehicles will impact local residents. Will sufficient land be allocated so that parking on the development or will there be over spill into Longford Road and Ryebank Road, placing additional pressure on a system already under stress. - - On a final note, additional information would be appreciated regarding what additional provision is planned regarding additional Primary and Secondary School places, Dental and GP services for the potential 270+ new residents of Chorlton. -

Medical care - there are not enough doctors places or dentist places to accommodate the number of people living in the new homes. - Education - there are not enough school places to accommodate children living in the new homes. - Traffic - there are already significant issues regarding traffic and the number of cars around the area. The safety of children at the local schools needs to be considered. There is already congestion on school days. Events at Longford track also cause congestion and parking issues around Ryebank Road, Nicolas Road, Newport Road, Daresbury Road, East Drive and Longford Road. This is particularly bad, often dangerous, every Saturday during parkrun, evenings & weekends throughout the whole of athletics season (April - September), weekday evenings for training at the track throughout the year and when the park is busy throughout the summer & on crisp winter days. Photographic evidence can be provided. Any new homes on the site proposed will make these problems worse. - Price - the price of new homes should be affordable to those who need homes most, first time buyers and young families. - If there is a through road it will be used as a shortcut causing even more traffic & danger to local residents. The surrounding roads are too narrow to take any more cars / traffic.

Chorlton is a small suburb that already struggles with the amount of traffic it has passing through every day. A huge number of apartments and housing has been built in Chorlton since I have lived there and more housing is not the answer. This would result in more traffic and a less safe environment for our children. I strongly oppose all of these plans, as I imagine most residents do. It would be good if the wishes of local people were taken into account rather than those of businesses.

This site should be left as a natural area of beauty for the benefit of the local residents. Not developed for the financial gain of mmu. This was gifted for leisure use to mmu. Let the residents continue to use for leisure - as they have always done.

None of the proposed options to provide access are appropriate because there is already too much traffic, parking and congestion on the surrounding roads, particularly Ryebank Road to the south and Longford Road. The accessibility to edge lane to the south would be reduced as this is already congested often from Ryebank road. Also. There is already a sign on edge lane that states 8 accidents in the last 3 years, around the point of rye bank road / edge lane junction. This will only get worse with increased vehicular access. - - The idea of affordable housing is a myth. History has proven that these new buildings in areas in South manchester such as Chorlton & Didsbury are unaffordable to most families and first time buyers who are the ones in most need of such new homes. - - Increased traffic because of new homes will put current children attending the local primary schools in increased danger. - - The consultation states lives of current residents will be enhanced. This is not true. Such problems will cause stress and not enhance lives of current residents.

I strongly feel that there should not be only one access, from Longford Road, but that there should be two points of access, one on each side of the development. Although I feel that quality modern houses will be a positive thing for Chorlton, I am very concerned about the extra traffic this will cause. Longford Rd, Newport Rd and Nicholas Rd are peaceful residential streets, but we already have traffic problems as we must park on the road and these roads are not wide. Higher levels of deliveries will also cause problems. There are also two schools in this area. It does not make sense to cause traffic to travel south if drivers want to travel north into the city.

This land was bequeathed to MMU for the specific purpose of sport. - Under this bequest MMU have no legal right to apply for housing development. - The bequest specifies sport usage only. - This will be legally challenged.

The traffic around Longford road and surrounding streets at present is a real problem at certain times in the day. The building of more homes will only make this worse. Having one entrance/exit at Longford will create a huge traffic problem for everyone who uses these roads regularly. Building expensive homes for wealthy people is not what this neighbourhood is about and I fear will create a different community. Affordable homes are needed for people to get on the housing ladder, for children who have grown up here but are now forced to move out. Nobody here wants more traffic and less green space around. There is no parking on Longford now as everyone has two cars and we all use the space at the top of longford near Ryebank fields, without this space we will have to park on the next street or the one after that. This is not acceptable when you come home late or with shopping etc.... It is a bad idea. The University of Manchester was given that land, shame on them to ruin a perfectly good neighbourhood. That is without even discussing the building nightmare for 18 months all going down Ryebank and Longford Roads!! A traffic survey needs to be done to show that this is not a viable plan.

I am opposed to this development. There is an existing traffic problem and the safety of children travelling safely to and from school is already a problem. With the new development children and parents and staff from the two local primary schools will suffer. The existing neighbourhood cannot cope with extra traffic

The loss of this land and natural wildlife would be devastating & a huge loss to the existing community residents. Not just chorlton residents but the residents of Firwood/Trafford, Stretford & Whalley Range. As with the Precinct proposal, after going to a consultation there are no plans with regards to the impact that 70 new homes will have on schools, GPs & traffic. The wider infrastructure (other than parking) does not appear to have been considered which does not give the existing Chorlton residents confidence in this proposal.

This area is a haven for local wildlife. I disagree with the proposal entirely.

The main problem with the plan is the impact of extra traffic on already congested streets, the impacted on the school run and access if there is only one road on longford rd. Very few of the existing house have off road parking so any more houses should not be built on longford rd, but facing on the fields.

I am very worried about the higher numbers of vehicles going up and down Longford road!!! As we already have a high number of cars connected with the school!!! I'm worried for the safety of our children!!!

The traffic situation on Longford Road is already awful. I have never known such a dysfunctional system to remain in place for so long. It is unfair on residents that appropriate changes have not been made to alleviate school-related traffic issues. It is also horrendous that school children have to witness tension about traffic and parking. For more traffic to be introduced and no plans in place to solve the problem would be terrible.

We do not need executive housing in this part of Chorlton. We need social/affordable housing. Manchester is known for making a difference - firsts! Lets be the first to reject the obvious and move towards a realistic approach to housing for the people of Chorlton not people coming into Chorlton. The roads around Chorlton are packed and at times there are too many cars - we should look at resident only parking and a zero tolerance approach to parking inappropriately. - Please ensure Chorlton residents are listened to and not MMU - they were given the land by the City Council, elected by the people of this City, for specific reasons - ensure this is upheld.

I disagree with any development on this site and I think it should be left undeveloped to support the wildlife already in situ. - - I think this is not really a consultation as the questions supplied were very biased towards development.

I support the development of the site. My only concern is the cul de sac highway proposal. I understand this is to allow the developer to market the site as Chorlton rather than Trafford. However, this is counter to good principles of urban design, good dev should be permeable. This would also allow a more even traffic flow north and south.

I am extremely concerned that Longford road is being considered as the only way in and out of the site. This will lead to a build up of congestion in an already busy area. Longford and Ryebank roads are very busy, especially in the morning with two schools nearby, extra housing would put pressure on those roads and schools. There is a problem with pollution with the increased number of cars and we have the problem of speeding cars on these roads. Longford stadium is a well used resource which means on athletic meeting dates, the roads around the park are particularly busy, especially Longford and Ryebank roads. I agree to the principle of new affordable homes being built, but these need to enhance an area, not cause extra congestion problems and pressure on local facilities. - I would like to see a smaller number of houses being built on the site with two access roads Longford and Rye bank with no through road facility.

Parking a nightmare, and roads already too busy at peak times, this will only cause more problems by the schools, dangerous and overcrowded

I am a local resident in the North end of Rye Bank Road (part of Trafford) so will be directly affected by the decisions on access to the new site. Since the proposed development is a Chorlton development it is appropriate to restrict access to the Chorlton site, with access from the North for cyclists and pedestrians only, and if absolutely necessary, emergency vehicles. Moreover, creating a through road would encourage the use of this route as shortcut thoroughfare resulting in even more traffic. - - My preference would be for the status quo rather than a new development, but if development must take place, I favour Option 4 for the above reason, and because of the less square and more irregular layout, and the likely slowing down on motor traffic by the winding vehicle route.

I am vehemently against any building on this piece of land! This is for several reasons: heinous amount of new traffic (to add to the amount caused by school traffic and weekend events at Longford) , destruction of fauna, disturbance of wildlife, potential Road and building damage by the construction companies, breach of contract (I was under the impression that land was bequeathed for leisure use and leisure use only!) - Amongst other things. - - I am very angry that plans are even to be considered! Again!

Strongly against any building on this piece of land whatsoever!

I would like for at least 50% of the homes to be much needed social housing, not everyone can afford to buy in the area with rising house prices but we do live, work and have families in the area. - I am not fussed if the houses fit into the character of the other local housing but it is important that they meet the highest energy efficiency standards and are made from more sustainable materials. - I am keen that the route through the housing does not become a rat run for people to drive between edge lane and great stone road, the rye bank road/ great stone road junction is challenging enough to cross at, especially when trying to cross with kids. Building in a route for bikes especially if it was through the tree planting would be great and help encourage more cycling. - - I appreciate that some thought has gone into the environmental aspects of the site with tree planting and the nico ditch to be enhanced and maintained, I like this option of the ditch cutting through the sight unhindered (apart from a cycle/foot bridge) by a road or housing with a 10m no build zone. I would also like to see some co-ordination with Trafford leisure services and the friends of Longford park to create a habitat of rough grassland that will be lost from rye bank fields. I have watched on many occasions Kestrels use rye bank fields to feed on voles living in the grassland. This new habitat could run along some of the edge of rye bank fields but within Longford park towards the Longford stadium end of the large field, seasonal drainage is an issue here anyway.

Traffic will be a nightmare - disagree with this proposal completely

The whole scheme should be scrapped. Chorlton needs neither more new hugely expensive houses or more traffic. The area surrounding the site will be too congested and the lovely open space which is a home to wildlife and a sanctuary to people like myself will be gone forever. No one believes these lies about the development being in keeping or wildlife friendly. It is simply a money making scheme which will make Chorlton even more dirty, rubbish strewn and congested than it already is.

This will not be affordable housing. Chorlton needs affordable housing - at the moment our children are unable to buy anything in Chorlton. These new properties will be bought by people moving up from London at inflated prices thus pricing local Chorlton people out of the housing market.

1.) I agree that the site should be used for housing development. It is a brownfield site with little amenity and biodiversity value at present. However, the development should maximise protection, maintenance and enhancement of the natural world - trees, vegetation, wildlife. - 2) I disagree with the (unstated) assumption that the priority should be for luxury homes. If housing need is to be addressed, there needs to be a mix of homes with a high proportion of affordable rented (social housing) provision. - 3) I see little consideration in the options for the positive usage of wind and sun direction - more could be done to utilise passive solar warming to reduce energy consumption. Trees should be planted on the north and east side. Hedgerows to separate the houses from the park. There should be a mix of public and private space. - 4) I agree with the option that disallow a through-way for vehicles. Therefore there should be only one vehicle entry, although a second emergency entrance might be appropriate (probably not). - 5) Cars should be restricted. I propose that the default assumption is that residents do not have cars. They should pay a steep premium for parking and this should be in a small area separate from the housing. The main thoroughfares should be vehicle free. See <http://www.vauban.de/en/> for ideas. - 6) Resilience should be considered in the worsening geopolitical and ecological context: food and energy sovereignty will be key to this, so include some growing space and consider a) passivhaus principles and b) local energy generation via solar water, pv and heat pumps for space heating.

It's ridiculous to over populate the area. There is a school right by there and congestion is bad enough. - There will be no green left in this country if everyone gets the right to build when they ask!!

I personally think 70 houses is an overdevelopment on this site especially that majority of proposals suggest access from Longford Rd. This road is already heavily congested. There will be further pressure on the local school(s) with Oswald Rd bursting at seams and St John's actively discriminating against non-Catholics. The proposal needs to include more affordable housing encouraging cycling. Opening Longford Park to Claridge Road side would be preferable. Using the site to provide local residents with additional recreational activities. Live-work housing would be much more appropriate for Chorlton than 5 bedroom housing. The aim should be at highest level of ecological housing perhaps using local materiality but not necessarily copying architectural styles. Is the proposal suggesting any small retail units? These houses will be quite far from Manchester/ Wilbraham Road shops. There needs to be provision of housing for all age groups with adequate facilities. Perhaps MMU can redevelop old swimming baths into a new swimming facility as part of 106 agreement? In that case local residents may look more favourably on the housing development.

This development is completely inappropriate. The land was bequeathed by MCC to MMU to provide sports facilities, from what I understand. MMU have failed to use the land properly. It should be developed either into sport facilities or be absorbed into Longford Park. - - Building new homes will create extra traffic in an area used heavily by families. As well as there being an environmental impact this will make the surrounding roads less safe. - - I would have more sympathy if the housing was to be affordable as the area is crying out for affordable housing. As it is this will do nothing to alleviate housing pressures for those having to leave the area because of prohibitively expensive housing costs.

I strongly disagree that this area of Manchester needs more Luxury Homes and I would like Councillors to try and justify why it does. Due to current market conditions in the housing market this area of Manchester is undergoing a process of gentrification, house prices are strong and the main motivation for the development must be that MMU wish to profit from this fact? - I wish Councillors to consider the following :- - What are the ethical considerations that guide their judgement on this ? and how does this proposal by MMU meet them ? - In what way will developing this piece of land in this way mitigate against climate change and protect the planet ? How much green space will be lost ? How many established trees removed ? - In what way will agreeing to the development combat inequality and protect people? How will it help poorer people locally ? - - I would like to propose an alternate scenario in which MMU seeks to act not for profit but for the good of the local and wider community in which it serves. Next door to Ryebank Fields is Longford Park which was gifted I think by the rich Industrialist John Rylands to the People of Manchester. Is MMU in a position to do the same ? Could Ryebank Fields be gifted to Manchester City Council for the development of an outdoor education facility run on Forest School Principles to serve school pupils across the City and particularly in South Manchester ? Could the land be further invested in, planting more native species and developing the bio diversity of the space ? - Many schools now have reduced outdoor space for children to use and Forest School styled education at Primary age is growing in popularity because of the reduced opportunities children have to be outside (Private Transport being a major reason) and because of evidence showing that outdoor play and learning has huge learning/ health benefits for children (helping to mitigate against the rising tide of obesity and mental ill health in children and young people) - - Manchester Council has no public sector facility of this kind. Could it enter into negotiation and take a longer view on this ?

It would be interesting to see statistics on car ownership in the local area. It would seem to me that 70 houses would bring far too many cars than the local infrastructure can handle. - Ryebank Road is part of my route when walking the my children to school. - It is already hazardous because of cars -those parked (on roads and footways) and moving. - Adding more cars to this would add risk for many children. - - I would dislike opening up the Trafford side of Ryebank Rd as that currently offers a slightly quieter/safer route for cyclists and pedestrians heading toward Manchester City centre. With cycling infrastructure so lacking in these areas the, even slightly, quieter routes are hugely valuable.

The ground conditions of this area should be closely examined. No mention is made in the consultation of the previous use as clay pits for brick works, landfill tips, several streams on the site. The suitability for building work needs to be investigated thoroughly.

I agree with principal of new homes but not the access from Ryebank road as this will make this and surrounding roads a lot busier. This is an area where a lot of children access the park and I'm very unhappy with increased traffic.

Strong consideration should be given to the impact to access for the neighbouring school and the impact of further traffic flow on a narrow access roads. Particularly Longford. - At pickup/drop off times there is regular grid lock already and there is a current risk to child safety which can only be made worse by further development without improvements to access. - I propose that development of the site should address these concerns and those of existing local residents who also complain about the school traffic and the issues it causes. - To this end I suggest the following: - - A corner of the proposed development adjacent to the school and accessed via Longford Rd be given as a school drop-off/pick-up zone. - - Pupil entrance to the school would be from this zone. (Staff/Services to use existing access routes) - - Benefits I can see are as follows:- - - It would take parked cars off Longford Rd at the start/end of the day and thus enable traffic to flow more freely. - - Addresses child safety concerns - - Addresses long held grip of local residents - - Means the school can be easily access via both Longford and Ryebank road to further facilitate traffic circulation - - New zone can also be used as visitor parking for new development. - - New Zone has potential to be used for additional overflow stadium parking -

I am appalled at this redevelopment proposal and strongly oppose it. This is a really beautiful green space that I regularly use for birdwatching and dog walking. This area provides a kind of natural habitat that is extremely rare and as a keen birdwatcher I have observed a wide variety of different bird species in this small site. This includes rare species like tree sparrows (considered a Red List species by the RSPB following a dramatic decline in numbers over the last few years). The council should be seeking to preserve green spaces like this, not build on them. Furthermore, building 70 additional houses in this area will add considerably to traffic volume on Longford Road and/or Ryebank Road. Longford Road is already busy with traffic for the primary school and the Stretford Park Run on Saturday.

I have 2 main comments about this site. - 1. The access here is very problematic. Longford Rd is not designed for any more cars to use and extra cars along here must be avoided. 70 houses of the quality proposed will have 2+ cars each. The access must be spread between Ryebank Rd to the south and to the Ryebank Road, Stretford to the north. Access off Edge Lane via Ryebank Rd Chorlton may well cause congestion at the junction but has to be preferable to using Longford Rd. At least if you split the access north and south, the total amount of cars using the roads would be divided in two. - 2. Chorlton doesn't need more expensive big houses! It needs affordable houses for the children of existing Chorlton residents to be able to buy rather than having to go elsewhere e.g. Stretford or Levenshulme. With smaller houses on this site, the number of cars per house would be reduced and therefore less traffic congestion. The houses could sit in well landscaped site, perhaps with play area or facilities that would benefit some of the residents of existing roads nearby.

The number of homes is far too many - the Chorlton area is already under stress with regard to the infrastructure in the area, all local schools are full to bursting, GP's are full to bursting and public transport does not get people where they need to be when they need to be there. It is stupid to propose to build this number of houses without any improvements to the local infrastructure. If these are family homes, where will children go to school? Where will people go for healthcare? How will they get to and from work - this site is a long walk from tram stops and there is only 1 bus along Edge Lane that goes between the Trafford Centre and Stockport, nowhere near town which is where many people work. It will just put more strain on the area to the detriment of existing residents.

The traffic on Longford road is already a huge issue which will be made worse by the new housing. There is no social housing, why? Where are all the children going to be placed for schools?

Traffic congestion is already very bad in this area. - Local public services are already stretched. I cannot see any proposals on how to alleviate these issues. - This development will have a negative impact on the people already living in the area.

The site is well used by local residents who look after it and control litter. Building executive homes does nothing for the so called housing crisis.

Traffic flow around the Longford park entrance is a nightmare at the best of times - So two access points are important for vehicles north and southside to prevent further congestion - The importance of the Two vehicular access points cannot be over stated as 70 high spec homes implies families with potentially 2 cars per house - So if the longford south side was the only access point this could potentially mean 140 cars bottle necking on longford road and especially at the junction of ryebank road and onto edge lane - - Chorlton already has plenty of family size home with owners wishing to down size when their children have left home - - Coupled with the need to support first time buyers it would be more useful and encouraging if the developers built more smaller homes 2 bedroom to support their needs - - We live on Nicolas road and understand the issues with traffic and schools and health services - There is also a concern that this development will be to stressful with issues caused leading to an exodus and also a devaluing of local properties - - -

I have not answered most of Qu5 as I find these questions leading, and it is not made clear whether (a) we are agreeing that this is what we would like, or (b) we are saying we feel this development would provide it. - - I live directly opposite Ryebank Fields on Longford Road. In principal I am not opposed to a low density development, however - - 1. I strongly object to the preferred option of one access road. - 2. I would also like to see this as a completely self contained development – i.e. the tree line maintained along Longford Road instead of this being replaced by housing. - 3. I would dispute that this is a low density development, given the size of the houses and therefore the number of people in them. - 4. I am disappointed in the council's lack of involvement in this particular plan - - The details of this are outlined below - - 1. Traffic - - The traffic problems along Longford Road, and to a lesser extent Ryebank, Nicolas and Newport Roads are long standing and well known. The roads are long and narrow, with no space for one car to pass another when cars are parked on both sides. There is a primary school (St John's) half way along Longford Road and another (Oswald Road) at the bottom. - - The traffic generated by this combination, plus the lollipop crossing at the crossroads of Longford and Oswald make it very difficult for any resident of this road to leave by car between 0835 and 0905, particularly if their ultimate destination is towards Manchester Road and into town rather than out through Ryebank and on to Edge Lane (the site of a third school) and the M60. - - The building of this development will create around 280 bedrooms. The assessment of 46 trips per car in the morning rush hour is not therefore, in my opinion, realistic. The council's efforts to get more people using public transport is admirable but we are the people who will be dealing with the reality – and in this case the reality is that each of these houses will have 2-3 cars, which they will use, further exacerbating an already difficult situation. - - In addition, the building of between seven and 10 houses on Longford Road itself, with front driveways, decreases the space available for passing places and also for school traffic to park. The notion floated by MMU that this can be solved by a combination of resident-only on street parking and a large car park for school parents on the St John's school site is not useful. It would only force schools traffic further down the road and create more pressure points along it. - - It is also interesting to note that MMU seems to have come up with the idea of a school car park, and included it in the document they put before the council, without asking St John's school what they thought of this proposal. - - A second Access Road - - MMU and Manchester City Council have been upfront about the reason why they want one access road – to maximise value because of the increased prices Chorlton homes can command. Neither has offered any other real reason why there should not be a second access leading out to the Trafford Ryebank Road. - - This is a shorter road with more modern housing which includes driveways – i.e. less on street parking. MMU's own submissions document notes that Longford and surrounding roads “...do not contain off-street parking and create a greater sense of enclosure to the street”. In other words, they also recognise that the problem is greater on the Chorlton side. - - If both sides took on half the burden the issue would be more manageable, provided both led to a cul-de-sac – i.e. not a through road. While understanding why both the council and MMU would want to maximise the financial opportunity here, I do not accept that this justifies the chaos which would be created in the Longford Road area. - - I also note that the gentleman MMU has chosen to front the traffic assessment, at least in the public consultations, lives on the Trafford Ryebank road. He told me this himself, along with at least one other person at another consultation. - - He seems like a very nice man, and I'm sure he's also very professional. I also understand that his particular circumstances have no bearing on either Manchester City Council's or MMU's preference, which is driven by economic factors. Nor do I want to appear vindictive. But the conflict of interest in this situation is obvious and I would like an assurance that he will not be directly involved in any of the process of traffic assessment for this plan. - - Council Strategies and Stated Aims relating to this issue - - There are a number of strategies which deal with

the issue of traffic, - - The Manchester Core Strategy - T1 touches on the need to reduce congestion and to reduce the negative impacts of road traffic - DM1 states that all developments should have regard to "...effects on amenity, including privacy, light, noise, vibration, air quality....road safety and traffic generation....vehicular access and car parking" - - The Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance - UDP Part 1 Policy T3.4 state that safe routes to school "should be integral to new development schemes" Under the current proposals children from the surrounding area walking to St John's school will be exposed to far greater volumes of traffic and will also be walking over the driveways of the newly built homes along Longford Road in rush hour. - - - - 2. Retain the Existing Tree line along Longford Road - - I would also like to see this development self contained on the Chorlton side in a similar fashion to the plans for the Trafford side. This would retain the tree line along Longford Road. - - Not only will this make it more visually harmonious, and more bio-diverse, it would also help to alleviate some of the problems which would be caused by the current proposal. - - At the moment the plans include 7-10 new homes along that stretch of Longford Road, all with driveways at the front of the house. The high percentage of car ownership these new properties are likely to attract will almost inevitably lead to cars also being parked on the road in front of those homes. Furthermore, the drives themselves reduce the amount of on-street parking available to schools traffic. - - Finally, the fact that the access to these drives runs across the existing pavement, which is a major school route for primary school pupils walking to St John's, creates a danger to those pupils in contravention of the council's own strategies on the subject. - - Enclosing the development, with all homes facing in towards the site rather than outwards on to Longford Road, and retaining the existing line of trees which mark the boundary with Longford Road, would solve much of this. MMU's stated aim is to "increase biodiversity" and create "a parkland setting". This would give it that opportunity to truly achieve that for all residents of the new site. - - This ties in with a number of Manchester City Council's key strategies: - - The Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy 2015 repeatedly emphasises the importance of street trees in enhancing the environment and neighbourhood. The "stated objectives" include assurance that: - "...Manchester and its stakeholders will improve the quality and function of existing green and blue infrastructure to maximise the benefits it delivers (and) use appropriate green and blue infrastructure as a key component of new developments to help create successful neighbourhoods..." - - The Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance also encourages street trees and states that the council will "...look to new developments to assist this aim" - - UDP Part 1 Policy T3.4 state that safe routes to school "should be integral to new development schemes" - UDP 16.1 says this: "New developments will fit more easily into their surroundings if they incorporate existing landscapes, and there will be a presumption to retain existing trees and planting with a high amenity and ecological value. If it is not possible to retain existing trees in situ, developers will be required to include appropriate replacement within the development site or the immediate area - - 3. Development Density - - MMU and the council have asserted that this is "low density development", based on the number of houses. In reality, the large size of each house compared to the surrounding area offsets this - all other houses in this road have a maximum of three bedrooms. In terms of the population increase therefore (280) the development is actually equivalent to 93 homes rather than 70. - - In other words, this is only slightly less than another street the size of Longford Road feeding straight in to Longford Road without plans for any infrastructure to mitigate this. - - The plans themselves are sketchily drawn, particularly in question 1 which is where people are choosing between them, and also somewhat misleading. The houses are surrounded by green. There is no car parking or drive space marked on them and therefore the overall impression of what this will look like is simply inaccurate. - - In addition, again in Qu1, the sketch for option 4 not only shows the entrance in the wrong place on the road, but also gives the incorrect impression that it is completely self enclosed. - - The lack of attention to detail on this is in marked contrast to, for example, the plans for Chorlton Precinct and I find it strange that MMU has not provided better and more accurate information and that Manchester City Council has not insisted on this. - - - - 3. Other Observations - - The council has made it clear that the main aim of this development is to provide "much needed" housing for the city's residents. I would therefore like to see a legally binding clause in this that the homes should be sold to owner-occupiers, and an absolute ban on any sort of overseas marketing. - - I would also like to put on record my disappointment at the council's apparent attempt to disengage itself from this consultation process. When these plans were first announced I tried on several occasions to have a conversation or an email exchange with anyone at the planning department who could give me some idea on what to expect. - - The requests were fairly simple - I wanted clarification on the initial drawings, particularly option 4, and I wanted an idea of when the consultation process might start. - - After many failed attempts to make contact I ended putting in a Freedom of Information request, which came back largely unanswered. I was even told the council could not say when the consultation process would be - at a time when I now know at least one of the venues had already been booked. It was only when it went to appeal that I got any meaningful response. - - Despite this request eventually confirming that the drawing for Option 4 is indeed inaccurate, that same drawing has been allowed to go into this consultation process. This is process the council is hosting on its own website - yet when I pointed this anomaly out to the council officer at the St John's consultation evening he said it was nothing to do with them, and I should talk to MMU. - - Yes, this is private land. But it is land formerly owned by Manchester City Council, gifted to MMU - for sporting activities. If this land is now proposed for housing, Manchester City Council has a responsibility to take an active part in steering the direction, particularly because of its history but also simply as part of the democratic process. - - The last attempt at a development in 1997 was indeed turned down by the Council. The impression therefore currently being given that it has no real input or power in this is simply not accurate.

Present plans seem to show virtually no consideration for peak traffic - either rush hour or when major events are on at Longford Park. This development will increase traffic to an area where resident parking is already a challenge. If the new development has no on street parking (as I have seen suggested) then visitors to the new site will simply park on nearby roads closest to the pedestrian access to Longford Park (already a tough parking area). - - This area has many young children too - increases in traffic represents a clear safety hazard to them - especially seeing as the precinct development will see people using these streets as a 'cut-through'. Current traffic calming methods are insufficient as it is - this clearly needs more thought.

Parking and traffic flow onto Longford, Newport, and Ryebank - Drainage of the site and effect on surrounding houses 9 field always floods in the rain) - Impact on school places , dentists, doctors - Trafford and Manchester councils working together so that dual access can be made and resources allocated fairly - Number of cars extra in the area - On street car parking needed - Impact of Longford park entrance and new development entrance being so close together . - Better to focus entrance in Firswood - Traffic already awful from Park Run, Trafford AC practices and events, Oswald Rd and St John's

You don't seem to have factored in local challenges about through traffic. This area is under great pressure - specifically in relation to local schools. - I am worried that you see to be going for high end housing which may not be affordable. - I believe that you should listen carefully to local ideas about eco-friendly housing. - You could include high quality housing that isn't all the large house type which will tend to be very expensive. - Having no on-street parking could be problematic and put pressure on local streets.

I am very concerned about the impact of the increased traffic that this development would bring. Both Longford and Ryebank Roads are already busy, with residents and parents taking their children to the local schools. All local roads in the area have cars parked on both sides and it can already be difficult to travel on these roads due to this and the level of cars already using the roads. A development of 70 houses of this type will mean a minimum of 150 cars, and they will need to travel via either Longford or Ryebank Road. Whilst I understand the need to build additional houses I feel that this area cannot cope with the traffic that this development, in its current form will bring.

I would like Chorlton's priority to be on affordable homes, reduced use of cars, and permeability rather than lifeless enclosed suburbia. - - I remain unhappy that the university is selling land that the council gave it on the understanding that it would be playing fields. - - The introduction to the consultation has simply taken a very biased self-serving statement by the university and cut and pasted it with no attempt at neutrality. These three consultations on Chorlton's redevelopment are laughably badly designed, with bare-faced resistance to gathering any views that might give a better result for the area and its community, just an attempt to tick the box on consultation and go ahead with what you've planned..

Illustrative Development Frameworks: I prefer Option 2, which completes the line of Rye Bank Road, while enhancing the setting of Longford Park. - Access: Improved access to Longford Park is to be welcomed, but must be matched by improved paths within the park. - Density: The proposed density is commensurate with that to the north of the site. It is arguable that a slightly higher density would be more in keeping with that to the south of the site. - Massing: I would prefer new homes to the 2 storeys, in keeping with those to north and south of the site. If the larger houses must be 3 storeys, then they should retain pitched roofs at the front, in keeping with the local character. - Materials: although the local character is described as Victorian, the character to the north of the site is 1930s. If the density is to match the north rather than south side of the site then it is this character that should be reflected. However personally I would like to see a contemporary response to the specific location, not a generic developer's attempt at pastiche.

This development will drastically change the area bringing more vehicles to an already over populated area. - The land should be used for more ecological purposes like a nature park / walk.

Chorlton does not need any more cars. The area is already overflowing and adding more 4/ 5 bedroom properties will bring 2/3 cars per household and thinking you will have no on street parking you're dreaming. Link I g the road to Ryebank will bring more traffic towards Great stone and Kensington which are already really busy and used as cut through roads

This is a great opportunity to bring a large and totally under utilised piece of land into good use. Given the housing shortage, this development would be really positive for broadening the available housing stock in Chorlton.

Retaining trees & bushes to help combat additional traffic pollution. Give bike & pedestrian priority when planning traffic calming measures / access / avoiding rat runs - everyone talks about traffic problems but if you make it easier to drive & park then No-one will ever consider getting out of their cars! Enhance park facilities for teenagers as trade off for lost green recreational space e.g. Skate park?

I don't agree with development on this site.

Concerned about vehicle access and significant impact this will have on surrounding areas on an area already exceptionally busy, given close proximity of two primary schools, Longford Park and the Medical Centre. Parking, waiting times at junctions, potential for accidents already very high on very congested Longford, Newport and Rye Bank Roads. - - Also very concerned about impact on already stretched schools (both local schools over-subscribed) and GP practice which again is far too burdened as it is. - - Loss of green space. More homes means more cars means more pollution. Local roads already in poor condition.

I am very concerned about the impact of extra traffic from these new houses on to Longford Road which is already almost impassable around school opening and closing time.

The development of 70 properties on this site is pure greed. This area is already a traffic nightmare and this will only heighten the problems. - - While it is clear there is a need to develop this site and bring new houses to the area, a development of this magnitude in a position where the infrastructure is already pushed to capacity is inconceivable. - - The building of 70 houses on this site at the same time as other developments in the area will lead to a catastrophic legacy for this council.

The proposals should include some social housing and housing for older people, including co-housing groups. More affordable mixed housing for families. Some low rise housing and some apartments.

While I recognise the need for 'executive' housing in Manchester and the shortage of available land within the M21 postcode, I cannot support these proposals owing to the following reasons: loss of public amenity, loss of natural habitat and the impact on local roads from the increase in vehicle movements. - Any road link to the Trafford side of Rye Bank Road would alleviate pressure on Longford Road but exacerbate pressure on Kensington Road. This would add additional vehicle movements to my road which is already used as a rat run. - I, and many others, use the site on a daily basis for public amenity which would be lost. I appreciate it is directly next to a large park and realise i may sound unreasonable. However, the key attraction of the site is its wildness and that it is not managed parkland. This is the point of loss of habitat. I understand an ecology study would be required and all that that entails but, i cannot support the further erosion of small pockets of green space, wherever they may be. - Announcements from senior politicians signalling their determination to develop these sites out suggest this consultation is something of an exercise in tokenism.

School and medical places need considering if 70 new homes are built. The plan makes no reference to this.

Please, please please look at the drainage issues. The land is very marshy. I live on Newport Road and we always have standing water under our house (sometimes up to 18 inches). When it rains, the garden has ponds in it for a long time after the rain has stopped. The consultation document states that there is a low risk of sea or river flooding but I think there may be a much higher risk from the water table. Ryebank fields is currently acting as a sponge - local legend holds that the reason the two Ryebank Roads were never joined is because the land was too boggy to build on. People will be upset if flooding is caused as a result of building on natural marshland. - I also strongly feel that half the vehicular access should be from the north - that corner of Longford Road is dangerous enough as it is and made worse by school traffic.

Traffic in, out and around the area would be increased by this development. The surroundings areas e.g. Quadrant roundabout and Edge Lane are already congested.

The traffic on Ryebank road, Longford road etc. is already very bad so it would be a bad idea to have more cars travelling along these roads. Access from ryebank only at the north side of the development would be the better option. - With plans for several new housing developments in the area it is worrying in terms of school places, doctors surgery places/appointments and whether or not there are enough facilities generally for all the new residents.

A significant concern is the congestion and traffic. This area of Manchester is already highly congested; both Manchester Road and Edge Lane often have long traffic jams. These are not going to be eased with the building of additional homes.

The area needs starter homes, affordable housing and housing at affordable rents. MMU are simply trying to obtain as much money as possible without regard to local social need. I am in favour of high quality buildings (who wouldn't be?) but I disagree with the type of development proposed.

I can't believe it's come to this, because I have always strongly supported leaving the area as a natural woodland site. Chorlton has other areas for housing. MMU have bulldozed local opinion, and thought only of profit. - Since clearly big institutions always win, and green spaces count for nothing these days, if houses are to be built, there needs to be as many green spaces as possible, and pedestrians and cyclists should be strongly prioritised over cars. Cars should be slowed down to 5mph by bollards and bumps. -

Access should not be via Longford / Ryebank Road at all as this is already a busy road at certain times. The local roads are narrow with a large number of cars parked either side of the road and Ryebank also has traffic calming. The junction onto Edge Lane at the bottom is already a difficult exit. The extra traffic will be a tremendous problem. There are two schools in close proximity. The large amount of traffic will be a danger to children and families and cause greater amounts of air pollution. The whole proposal to exit the site at Ryebank and Longford is flawed. - The number of larger houses described as executive is not at all in keeping with the neighbourhood. More smaller houses should be planned. Fewer larger houses as these will have greater numbers of larger vehicles. The houses should be 3 and 4 bedroom only. They should be planned to be more affordable for new buyers and young families. The houses should be 2 floors only and not 3.

1. Implications of new development for existing drainage problems in Chorlton must be considered. This site currently absorbs excess water and if it is built upon there will be a loss of existing drainage and an increase in the need for drainage. There are already problems for some homeowners after heavy rainfall and a major problem at the junction of St Clements Rd and Edge Lane. - 2. Implications for local schools, GP practices and other services need to be considered. - 3. Vehicular access onto Edge Lane is already difficult at peak times and this will be exacerbated by this development so solutions need to be built in at the development stage.

It is not clear what we are being asked to agree to in Question 1. - I would like to see a majority of affordable 2-bed homes on this site, with perhaps a few 3/4-bed options. There is a social need for affordable housing. I am not in favour of this site being used for luxury homes, as proposed. - Lack of on-street parking could increase hard-landscaping and, thus, water run-off. - I have seen an alternative proposal for affordable eco-housing on this site. This would be more in keeping with the character of Chorlton. As the alternative proposal states, an eco-development would mitigate traffic and parking issues as residents would be likely to have fewer cars.

My preference would be to keep the fields as green space. I understand that there is a need for more housing, so would want to weigh up the balance over a wider area as to where development should or shouldn't happen; I would like the decisions to be based on environmental perspective, e.g. biodiversity, as well as amenity. If this green space is to be used for housing I want to see genuine affordable housing. Housing priority should be those struggling for a home at all not 4 and 5 bedroom properties. In terms of layout, I think it essential that green corridors are provided - hence my preference would be options 2 or 4, preferably with more space left green than in the plans. I have concerns at the impact of an even a 70 dwelling development on surrounding roads which are already heavily used e.g. for school pick up/drop off.

Are you going to improve local services. What about GP services, already overstretched. Had to wait 4 weeks for an appointment at Chorlton health centre, then had to leave before being seen as running 45 mins late and I had to get back to work. Where with these new residents fit in

Changes to drainage should take account of the effect on other areas of Chorlton. I suggest a drainage impact survey be carried out by an independent consultant to advise on the likely effects.

I live in Firswood. have you seen the volume of traffic in the Stretford/Chorlton border? - I have and this proposal will just add to any already poor situation. - Cars parked everywhere and the huge amount of traffic throughout the day is dangerous to residents. - - I strongly oppose this proposal.

Provide to points of entry so Longford road does not become stranded by too much traffic. - Again the council needs to make provisions for schools, GP surgeries and car parking.

The way Questions 5 to 11 are drafted is completely loaded and wholly inappropriate for what is billed as a 'consultation exercise'. In relation to 'design principles' do you really expect me to 'Disagree' with statements such as "The Development Framework will only allow new homes of the highest design quality that are in keeping with....." To disagree with this statement would imply that the design of the new homes (as yet unseen) will NOT allow the highest quality design i.e. possibly the lowest quality design is the alternative. OR how can I disagree with the statement "An emergency vehicle access from Ryebank Road to the North may be considered if this can be appropriately designed"? Does this mean it may not be considered or it may not be appropriately designed? OR EVEN "Create streets that are shared by cars, bikes and pedestrians". By inviting me to disagree the implications are beyond ludicrous!! I could go on but enough is enough. The compilers of this questionnaire may feel I am being pedantic but I refuse to be misled into providing positive answers these so-called design principles which could in any way be construed as supporting this development in its current format. I would be willing to answer questions which are drafted in a manner which is actually consultative and means something. - Next comes the laughable statement on Page 2 of the Ryebank Road Development Framework Summary - "The site hasn't been used by the University for many years because of their strategy to relocate to a city centre Campus to provide high quality 21st Century teaching environments for their students." - The site originally was part of the Sports Facilities of the then Manchester Polytechnic - it was never part of any teaching/learning facility, but the area was by students historically and has / is used on a regular basis by local residents over many years. I have looked carefully on their website and cannot find any mention of how the funds used from the sale of the land will be used - never mind how they will enhance student experience. MMU have never had any desire other than to sell the site for residential development. This desire to sell on the part of MMU is not because it cares about housing provision within Manchester (other than student accommodation) but simply because sale for residential development will provide a higher financial return regardless of the impact of local communities. - Finally, I relation to vehicle access to the site. I did ask some of the representatives present at the St Johns School consultation session about splitting the Access between Longford Road in the south and Ryebank Road in the north but not creating a through route. i.e. To mitigate the impact on one area alone whilst not creating a potential rat run.. I was referred to the various options laid out in the document but also told that such a proposal would create additional problems because Ryebank Road (north) is in Trafford, and dealing with a second local authority may be problematic!! Such a response is neither satisfactory or supportable. The last time I looked there wasn't a giant wall dividing Manchester and Trafford in Longford Park or on the land concerned. Any development of this land impacts on the Residents of both local authorities who should at least work in tandem regardless of where the majority of the impact is seen to lie. -

This development appears to be targeted at well off people. Housing should be aimed at people on lower and poor incomes who need help more than the middle class. The scheme will drive up the cost of housing in Chorlton which is already inflated. The plan to allow vehicle access from Longford Rd is bonkers. There is a primary school on the road, lots of children, heavy traffic at school opening and closing times and no speed deterrents. Apart from 20 mph limit which everyone ignores. Speed bumps won't solve gridlock when the school closes

I think the council are completely missing the opportunity to be imaginative and think outside the box. These houses will be virtually out of site and looked at by hardly anyone except those that live there. Who cares if they are in keeping with the Victorian architecture. I love architecture but this is not in the centre of Chorlton this is tucked away. Be creative, build imaginative eco friendly efficient homes. Appeal to green minded people, a collective way of living , introduce community schemes and make it a CAR FREE estate. The people who buy the houses will know cars are not permitted apart from for deliveries. Those who insist on having a car will not buy the homes. Chorlton has great transport links, it is time to start challenging the idea that everyone has to be a car owner. As result the estate will be a green quiet save place to live. Make it permit parking on the adjacent streets to avoid the residents parking just outside the estate. Allocate some of the houses to current Chorlton residents over 60 who perhaps want to down size and thus encourage movement in the current housing stock in Chorlton to free up those 4/5 bed houses for the executive homes you propose building there. Allocate some of the homes to social housing. Chorlton is becoming full of young and very wealthy people, its character is changing. It used to be more working class. We need to keep a balance of residents here to maintain the arty, green, multi cultural, open minded haven that it is and that makes it so appealing.

Residents are not being invited to comment on the proposal to develop Ryebank Fields but rather to select their preferred design. This resident does not want Ryebank Fields to be developed but it seems that the Council has already drawn up plans to do so. - - I have several concerns about proposals to develop 70 executive homes on Ryebank Fields: - - - Loss of natural habitat. MMU promotes itself as the UK's greenest university yet appears untroubled that it is selling off green space for development. Ryebank Fields is home to a variety of natural habitats: grassland, scrub and woodland. Manchester has few wild green spaces like this so its loss would be keenly felt. - - There will be an increase in traffic levels and demand for on-street parking along Longford and Ryebank Road which will reduce air quality, increase noise and pose risks to road safety. Longford Road is a one way street that is already impassable at certain times of day with large numbers of vehicles dropping and collecting school children. Both Ryebank Road and Longford Road are also used as a short cut between Edge Lane and Manchester Road. The addition of 70 new executive homes will add to already high levels of congestion and add to demands for on-street parking. - - Several of the houses along Longford Road suffer from subsidence and are underpinned. The passing of heavy vehicles is likely to contribute to further structural weaknesses. Does the Council have plans to mitigate the possible structural impact to local residents' property?

We live close to the site. Our first reaction to the proposals were hesitant, but we support the development as there is a need for more housing. However, we feel very strongly that the Ryebank / longford roads should not be linked for vehicle access. (No problem with Cycle / pedestrian access). Linking Ryebank and Longford and his would create a rat-run, and impact the primary schools on both roads. In addition Great Stone road is already a commuter route and additional traffic flow would have a negative impact on resident's on the rye bank side of the site. - - You reference the "Victorian" character of the area - the majority of housing in this area dates back to 1920s and 1930s rather than the Victorian period. Our concern is that faux Victorian architecture would look would like a jarring and risk looking cheap (like many new build estates across the country) and often doesn't age well. We'd support something more modern or better matched to the existing housing stock in the area.

There has been no consideration of the volume of traffic already on Longford Road. I would suggest that you ought to visit Longford Road at 3.30, 4 and 4.30pm during term time to witness the large volumes of traffic and frequent 'gridlock' situations which occur now let alone with the addition of 70 new homes. - - There is no option for there to be no access via Longford Road for the new housing estate but that would be preferable as it would avoid adding large volumes of traffic to an already busy area.

I live at Ryebank Road in Chorlton and find the prospect of even more cars on our road quite horrific. We are already being used as a thoroughfare for cars cutting off the corner of Barlow moor Road. The sports facility in Lonford Park does not have adequate parking so their customers park on the roadside in the evenings and weekends. During the summer months the same sports facility is used by schools in the south of Manchester for their sports day. It is impossible to get traffic up and down the road which has lead to frequent unpleasantness between drivers. What you are intending to do will create even more traffic which our road cannot take. traffic lights at the bottom of the road leading to Edge Lane would cause hazards for local people and blocked side roads. Ryebank fields have always been seen as a tranquil place where local people have always cycled or walked through with the blessing of MMU. I feel annoyed and sad that my grandchildren will not have that green space to explore, walk, cycle in or play with their dogs. I also fear for both them and other local residents at the inevitable, potential increase in traffic and fear some one will have an accident in the bid to increase the ever growing home building that is changing the "village" atmosphere that was always Chorlton.

If this development is to go ahead - and I disagree with the whole concept, not just the details, as wild space is desperately needed in Chorlton - the 70 homes is far far too many for the surrounding roads, schools, GPs, etc. I think a maximum of 20 homes. - - These should be mixed housing - social housing, a few private family homes, and some co-housing for older people. Contrary to your plans, we do not need this many more expensive family homes in Chorlton. We need to house people who live here already, rather than attracting many more wealthy people and adding to the increasingly monocultural demographic. Chorlton has always been a lively, mixed community, not exclusively a wealthy middle class suburb, and that's its strength and attraction. I understand the developers' wish to build and sell more expensive homes here, but it's not in the interest of Chorlton residents. - - I live in Nicolas Road, off Ryebank, and am very concerned at the effect of 70 homes' worth of cars on the nearby streets. Again, contrary to your plans, this will not mean 40 extra vehicles and lots of tram and bike use. Each house will have at least 1 vehicle, and if they are to be family homes, the vehicles will be in constant use ferrying children around - this is the reality of middle class family life. It is already hard to cross Longford and Ryebank Roads at different times of the day - what effect will all the other cars have? At the very least, we will need serious traffic calming schemes on our roads to avoid them being used as rat runs more than they already are, plus residents' parking permits. The best solution would be to not build so many houses. What a shame to attract people to Chorlton because of the attractive way of life, and then create a scheme that would be chaotic and detrimental to them and all of us who already live here. - - Your descriptions of keeping the space green are in my opinion, window dressing. The ecology and biodiversity of this space would be destroyed in the process of building and inhabiting such a housing estate. Keeping the ditch and planting more trees wouldn't help this. - - In summary - if you've decided already to destroy this habitat in order to build houses, then be realistic about the number - 20 maximum. Access should be half onto Longford, and half north on to Ryebank (I understand that this is Trafford and therefore affects house prices, but it needs doing.) Housing should be mixed, allowing for the less wealthy and the elderly who need to be near their families and friends. The scheme in its proposed form should fund at least one extra school and one GP surgery in Chorlton. I hope you think very hard about going ahead with it in its current form.

I am dismayed that the current plans for this valuable site is for developing so few executive homes when what is needed are good quality affordable housing units. Chorlton does not need further gentrification through the development of high cost exclusive homes - we have plenty of those. We need ambitious and innovative ideas for creating a housing scheme for people who can't currently afford to live and work in Chorlton. This land is much loved and wanted by local residents so if it is going to be redeveloped for housing then the scheme needs to demonstrate real value to local people and create real housing opportunities for people who currently have limited options in this area. The scheme as it stands is beyond disappointing - we don't want or need an exclusive development. What we want and need is well thought through and innovative plans for affordable housing.

Try to keep as much green space as possible, ideally keeping this as a green belt. - If building must occur on this land, try to have as much affordable housing as possible, instead of the larger 5 bedroom housing.

Chorlton has a abundance of 3,4,5 bed homes. It lacks good quality homes for older downsizers, and also affordable property's. This seems like a exclusive development that helps local needs.

General Point- Traffic increase is a concern child safety playing nearby. - - what will be the community contribution to redevelopment. How will it benefit existing community, suggest back in to local area eg leisure centre.

So far no mention of energy efficient homes, solar panels? - Would prefer a mix of private owned and rented.

Keep existing trees were possible. Would like to see terraces and more affordable homes with larger area as open space, space for use for residents. - -Issues of increased traffic needs to be addressed in chorlton. More traffic lights and crossings. - - Housing development needs to be addressed issues of defensible space.

The design and layout needs to not look like suburban any place. - Needs to have more urban feel doesn't necessarily mean more units. - opportunity to do something more interesting, Eco friendly, self build area. - Needs to have much more consultation

I support the plans in general but multiple access by road will be needed. Local facilities will need to be considered for the families who move in eg there is not enough primary school places currently.

I am opposed to the loss of this wild space. The land is a much needed wild space for children & residents of all age groups. The pollution created by 70+ new vehicles in the area is a threat to physical & mental well-being of local people and especially children. This land was a gift to the people of Manchester. Please respect the natural beauty of this place.

MAJOR CONCERNS RE: ACCESS The surrounding streets at times are impassable ESP school run times. Local residents are held hostage in there street by impatient car drivers from OUTSIDE the area THIS CAN NOT BE ALLOWED TO WORSEN. - G.P services in the area are over-stretched and it is impossible to see a GP in less then 2 weeks. - The residents should not have additional traffic calming imposed on them to allow this development. - H.G.V traffic will only worsen the roads- LOOK AT RYEBANK RDIT IS A DISGRACE. Someone will get there property damaged with such huge equipment having to come down a narrow street. - - It is a space used by a lot of people ans I would prefer that it remains a green open space. - - MMU SHOULD BE ASHAMED - I also thought that it was quite concerning that this 'rep' went onto say that he lived in the Trafford side of Ryebank. This person clearly had a vast interest in trying to persuade us that the proposed single access was the correct one. This person has a conflict of interest and surly cannot act in am unbiased way.

The mayor issues here the traffic congestion. Longford and Ryebank roads are already congested. People buying bug houses will have a least 2 big cars which will not be left on there drive. - The development should include some low rise (mas 3 storey) flats starter homes for local younger people.

I live in Chorlton in a one bed flat which is owed by the housing association, I have bought my lease. Will the locals be able to have first viewing with the opportunity to bid before outsiders of Chorlton

The location of the proposed development is an area already under considerable strain due to the high level of traffic flow from two primary schools, a busy local park, and existing narrow residential roads that are used as a fast cut-through by people of Chorlton, Stratford and beyond. It is absurd to further add to this with yet more housing. Additionally there is totally inadequate current parking on the surrounding roads to this development, as Oswald Road has restricted parking to the number of houses, and the roads Newport, Nicholas and Longford all have an inadequate amount of street parking for the number of residents vehicles. This is further compounded by the additional parking and traffic seven days a week for school and event activity such as the Longford Park runs and Farmers Markets at the weekends. No additional provision for traffic control or parking has been introduced as the local area has been overloaded beyond capacity for the amount of traffic this causes. Additionally vehicles continuously void the gridlocked centre of Chrotlon around the four banks junction by cutting through Oswald Road and all rods leading from it to avoid the traffic, but at the high risk of human safety on these residential streets. - - The proposal on these plans of not having a 100% road that runs through the site and allows everyone access/exit on the Firewood end of Ryebank Road is particularly dangerous. The roads of Longford, Newport and Nicholas are already used by huge amounts of traffic with people regularly breaking the speed limit. I live on Newport Road and believe this development would lead to road deaths and injuries on these immediately surrounding roads. I myself have experienced and witnessed near misses, car damage and picked up dead pets from the road that have been left to die by fast drivers. The schools are at breaking point and the local area suffers from flooding of the water table so the building on this land will have only a negative impact on this, as well as reducing the precious little green space we have left in this city. I disagree that this development will 'add' to the biodiversity of the locality as you will be ruining a wildlife area for the sake of executive homes. - - I am appalled at the lack of thought and planning that will ultimately lead to injury and loss of life due to the excess of traffic that the Ryebank Road and Charlton Precinct new planning proposals will bring to existing residents. The other argument that this will add to the environmental biodiversity of the area lacks any credibility and the land being developed was originally donated to the university for recreational use for the people of Manchester. As a resident on the road and locality immediately impacted by this plan I am strongly apposed and believe it will have a negative impact on the quality of life, biodiversity, air quality and safety.

There is no mention of social housing in these plans. Shame on you Manchester City Council. This is on opportunity to have eco designed homes which combine social housing within . - - The favoured layout with the exit only to the South is completely ignoring the 2 schools that have the corresponding cars and pollution. There is NO consideration given to the children's safety by adding yet more traffic. A better solution is to have a single exit point to the North where there are no schools. This is no even given as an option!!

Ryebank Road Development Framework Comments - - [x] Option 4 principles preferred as new development is less imposing to existing adjacent residential properties and incorporates a more informal design - in keeping with the parkland setting. - - [x] Strategy states avoid cul-de-sacs - Option 2 incorporates one. - - [x] Concerns with extent of 3 storey development. If any proposed - to be restricted to development away from existing 2 storey residential housing. - - [x] Opportunity to create an exemplar 21st Century high quality sustainable eco friendly housing development targeting zero carbon rating. 'mock Victorian' architecture is not a prerequisite. - - [x] Enhance the existing pedestrian and cycle route through the site linking the east and west Ryebank Roads (in particular route to metro link at Firswood and/or Old Trafford). - - [x] Retain and enhance the existing tree canopies to the perimeter of site - including Longford Park, and perimeter residential properties, to maintain privacy to housing / gardens. - - [x] Retain existing biodiversity of site including perimeter hedgerows / woodlands and existing Nico Ditch. - - [x] Existing ground subsoil - (with landfill within an old 'clay pit') requires a ground gas risk assessment with practical solutions to avoid a longterm environmental hazard; the potentially contaminated land with associated costs for remediation works must not compromise the design standard of the development. - - [x] Concerned about impact of additional vehicular traffic in vicinity of St John's school - - [x] Need to ensure adequate provision of school, doctor, dentist, caring services to meet needs of additional people. - - [x] Developer Contributions - to include provision of :- - - [] Overall Chorlton's new housing development should provide a mixed tenure provision - (eg affordable housing; starter homes; adaptable housing targeting single person / parent occupancy which could easily be converted to elderly person /disabled 'accessible' housing); - - [] green infrastructure including open space; - - [] public realm improvement and protection of and enhancement of Chorlton cultural heritage including safety and security improvements -

It is my opinion that there is a lack of any provision for older people in these plans. There are many long standing Chorlton residents, me being one of them who live in large houses and would like to downsize preferably into a new home - heating and insulation being a key issue. 3 storey houses are not what is needed. Older people are looking for bungalows - there are none in Chorlton, in fact hardly any in Manchester. This proposed housing development looks to be aimed at families. A new development of 70 homes needs to cater for a mix of ages and not just families. Older people moving will free up family homes so you achieve the same aims re number of families rehoused. Also I strongly oppose the idea of have either a single access via Longford road or a road that runs through the estate I support the idea of two separate entrances with pedestrian accesses between them.

My feelings are that the land should be left as it is, there is no need for a housing development.

Please take the time to read the below as its importance to people's living in the area deserves the time to be heard!

- Thank you.
- - The consultation questionnaire appears deeply flawed, to the extent it gives the impression it seeks to steer those using the questionnaire towards answers that consultants might profit from, rather than an open and honest description of opinion.
- - With regards Ryebank fields development:
 - - The residents of the neighbourhoods surrounding the fields appear to be paying the price for MMU profiteering, and use such profits to benefit their business models, which puts little or nothing back into the environment they have plundered.
 - For a highly regarded, 'Green', University their action to sell open Gwen space for total profit is reprehensible.
 - - Manchester City Council are giving the impression that their extraordinary close working relationship with MMU is blinding them in their quest to support new housing to the detriment of current rate payers from the proximity of the fields.
 - Why do the Ryebank fields proposals not include access split between the Manchester City side of Ryebank Road and that of the Trafford side. Is the closeness or the relationship getting in the way of sense, for Political and monetary reasons, to the disadvantage of current Manchester developments?
 - - Described below are significant issues that require real solutions that should be implemented before any planning is agreed.
 - These are issues that are current now, even before additional housing across Chorlton severely further impacts to crisis levels.
 - - Dangerous congestion:
 - Traditional methods showing statistics per vehicle per hour/minute, during traditional peak hours are only a small part of the investigation that would be required in this case.
 - Societies use of home delivery services creates high speed light goods vehicle trying to meet time slots and deadlines. Both day and night.
 - The significant increase of the use of the athletics stadium and throughout the weeks evenings, and weekend days and evenings, along with the new phenomenon of 'Park Run' brings more and more congestion, road rage and damage to parked vehicles through volume of traffic, day and evenings.
 - The now regular use of Longford park stadium car park by film companies is bringing heavy goods vehicles and vehicles ferrying actors in and through the neighbourhood, day and night.
 - The area is a high speed 'Rat run' to avoid constant congestion at Chorlton Cross. Both day and night.
 - Dangerous 'Road Rage' is a regular occurrence due to significant residential roadside parking, with few gaps to manoeuvre. Day and night.
 - All three proposed Chorlton housing developments will impact on the above because the area has become a trunk road through-route rather than a neighbourhood for people to safely live.
 - - Services:
 - Health services and education services in the proposals paint a picture of availability and availability within walking distance. This is true if there were availability of doctors appointments and school places to accommodate all the adults and children that three Chorlton developments would bring.
 - All three have to be considered together.
 - - It is wholly improper to deal with each in isolation in a manner that appears to take no account that each service is already at breaking point.
 - - Drainage:
 - The whole of the area has a high after table with clay keeping the ground sodden 6 months of the year.
 - The drains are rarely cleared to assist storm water removal. The sewers locally appear to be in poor health with dips in the roads when sewers collapse.
 - How does Manchester City Council propose to ensure that new proposals do not adversely impact on the crumbling Victorian infrastructure. It would be foolhardy and disrespectful to current residents to pass the buck onto water authorities where upgrades cannot be guaranteed. I take the junction of High Lane and Manchester Road as an example where storm water flooding cannot be resolved.
 - - Pollution/Environment:
 - Traffic jams, manoeuvring, road load increases and general congestion is increasing pollution around children, families and all residents now. Three new developments, where, whether we like it or not experience shows cars remain an essential part of society: will increase pollution further. Whilst removing a green lung next to the problem and increasing it further is reprehensible. Particularly for a public body and quasi public body that claim environmental credentials!
 - - Conclusion:
 - Reading the Proposals, the submitted Executive documents and the tone of the recorded Executive meeting, the appearance is that the monetary value, and 'partnership' to The Council, MMU and Developers takes greater importance than the risks described above, to current residents.
 - - Thank you for reading and considering my comments.
 - - - - -

1. Drainage. You mention a natural drainage system - what does this mean? At present, the fields and surround school and park land provide soakaway land. For much of the winter months, the fields are totally waterlogged - large parts of the park also turn to lakes. Where is all this water going to go? Has any work been done to look at this question properly (rather than just the 'oh, it will just go into the land and the drains, like all rain' answer that I was given at the public consultation)? There are already a lot of part of the pavement that become impassible in heavy rain. One part of the pavement on Longford Road regularly has to be kitted out with stepping stone bricks and a plank. - 2. Demand for local services. At present, I struggle to get a doctors appointment. Last time I tried to get one the best they could do was a phone appointment in two weeks' time. What provision will be made to increase local services like doctors, school places etc. once these new developments are in place? - 3. Affordable housing. I'm concerned about the lack of affordable housing provision in the Ryebank Road part of the development. I understand that this is offset by provision in the precinct development, however I would prefer it to be included throughout to avoid creating a fancy enclave. Particularly given that 'affordable housing' wouldn't actually be all that affordable in Chorlton, my preference would be to keep it all mixed up to help maintain the diversity of the neighbourhood. - 4. Traffic. I'm concerned about the impact of increased traffic on Longford Road. At minimum, there should be a comprehensive traffic survey, with the results and potential solutions communicated to local residents for further consultation. The idea (expressed at the public consultation) that a traffic survey hasn't been conducted for fear of residents becoming angry is just silly. With two primary schools on the street, there is a safety issue in addition to the obvious problems of gridlock and parking. At the consultation I attended, there seemed to be a lot of talk about making Longford Road one-way. I would ask whether residents of the parallel streets (Newport Road & Nicholas Road) have been consulted about this, as it would naturally increase traffic on those streets heading in the other direction. One point that I didn't hear discussed much was the congestion at the Ryebank Road/Edge Lane junction. I would request that this also be looked at if there is to be increased traffic from the new development at this end of the site. - 5. Building works traffic. I'm concerned about the level and type of traffic that will need to be going back and forth to the site during building works. I would appreciate some assurances that this issue is being considered and what mitigation is being put in place. - 6. Nature. The loss of the unmanaged grassland is obviously going to hit local wildlife. Is the work on the tree barrier between the park and the site going to really maximize preservation of wildlife areas, or is going to be more of a tidying up to enhance the park view for the new residents? The cynic in me suspects that the priorities will be creating security, privacy and views for the new houses rather finding a balance with whatever it is the bats and newts need, but I would love to be proved wrong! Additionally, I would not want to see any of the mature trees in that area go, but that doesn't seem to be specified as yet. - 7. Opportunities. Is there any scope for using this development to improve the surrounding area more generally? Improvements in maintenance and design of Longford Park would be very welcome; the planting in particular gets worse every year and is currently rather embarrassing. I suspect this is unlikely given that it is a different council (unless Trafford get involved via the Northern access route). Improvements to the local area generally however, in terms of facilities, services, street maintenance etc. would provide benefits to both existing and new residents. - - Finally, I would just add that I have regularly used the fields for walking over the last few years. For health reasons, I had to build up to walking 30 minutes a day and walking around the fields provided a nice alternative to routes round the park (apart from when it's been raining and then it's difficult to find 30 minutes worth of dry land - even on concrete paths in the park!). The area of silver birch trees at the northern end are particularly beautiful, and I enjoy the long grasses, watching the birds at the blackberries, picking my way through the brambles over the ditch... I realise that we need housing and this will trump the enjoyment of green spaces, but I thought it was worth noting that they are enjoyed!!

Response from Chorlton Civic Society: - - Chorlton Voice (The Chorlton Civic Society) appreciate the opportunity to be consulted on the three significant development opportunities in Chorlton and has engaged with our members to review the available material. Members have a range of views and this response aims to pick out key issues. - - General Comments - - We are concerned that, although the three sites are being grouped for the purposes of consultation, they are being considered in piecemeal fashion. There appears to be no overall context which will allow the cumulative impact of the schemes to be taken into account. - The number of dwellings in Chorlton has steadily increased in recent years. These three sites, if approved, will add a significant further number of additional properties. We consider that the implication of increased numbers of households on already stretched public services such as schools and medical facilities needs to be considered. This is of particular importance as these three sites represent some of the few sites potentially available to accommodate such uses. - We therefore consider that there urgently needs to be a refreshed overall vision for Chorlton which these and other proposals can be assessed against. This should reflect anticipate changes in shopping habits and emerging new technology in transport. - We would like to see the developers of each scheme to commit to future proofing the developments, including high standards of energy efficiency and adaptability. All new buildings should be low carbon or even carbon neutral in line with the climate change strategy. New dwellings and the Precinct car park should cater for electric vehicle charging. All residential units should be 'lifetime homes', accessible for disabled people and occupants can stay put as they age, in accordance with Manchester's Age Friendly Strategy, "Manchester, a Great Place to Grow Older". - - Ryebank Playing Fields - - We consider that the consultation on this site is fundamentally flawed as being too narrow and premature. - Firstly, the proposal to develop the site for housing cannot be considered in isolation from potential alternative uses. Policy EN10 of the adopted Core Strategy states that proposals on existing open spaces and sport and recreation facilities will only be permitted where the site has been demonstrated to be surplus for its current open space, sport or recreation function and it could not fulfil other unsatisfied open space, sport or recreation needs. - - No evidence has been shown to demonstrate that the playing fields are surplus. Just because the University has no intention to use the site again does not mean that they are surplus. Has any thorough market testing been carried out to identify if any alternative sport or recreation providers are interested in bringing the site back into use? Even if no alternative sport or recreation provider could be identified, it is our opinion that the site could satisfy other open space needs. There is high demand for allotments in the area (as recognised in the reasoned justification to Policy EN10), for example. The site also provides valuable wildlife habitat. As the population of the area increases, the need for open space also increases. - - Secondly, we do not believe that any potential development of the site can be fairly considered without a proper understanding of the ground conditions and their implications. Most of the site was formerly clay pits which were backfilled with unknown fill material. Moreover, the site was originally crossed by watercourses and it is unclear how these were treated during the clay extraction and backfilling and whether they represent a problem for development. Whilst we appreciate that there may be technical solutions to these problems, we consider that they should be addressed upfront. The cost of dealing with the ground conditions will significantly affect the viability of any development. Furthermore, solutions such as piling or ground compaction would cause substantial noise and disruption to surrounding dwellings. - - In the unlikely event that the housing proposal passes the test of policy EN10 and can address the poor ground conditions, then we are sympathetic to the argument that this is a sustainable location for new housing that would reduce the need for development in potentially less sustainable locations. However, we fail to see how "large suburban housing" meets the needs of the area. Any development should provide substantial affordable housing. - - Next Steps - - We look forward to seeing the report to cabinet reflecting on the outcome of this consultation and offer the opportunity for the results to be presented to a future open meeting of Chorlton Voice. - - However, given some of the fundamental issues raised, we consider it inappropriate for there to be no further public consultation until planning applications have been submitted, by which time the developers' ideas will have been fixed. - - Yours faithfully, - - , on behalf of Chorlton Voice (Chorlton Civic Society). - Chair@ChorltonVoice.org

I am concerned about the impact on the local infrastructure and the amenities in the Chorlton area. 3,4 and 5 bedroom homes will attract families with children, this will mean the need for an increase in school places. In your map of amenities in the local area, you show that there are several schools within walking distance. The proposed development is in the borough of Manchester, there is only one Manchester maintained non-faith school within walking distance from the site- Oswald road school, this school has recently expanded to three form entry and is at capacity. The other schools on the map include- St. John's which is a Catholic school, two special needs schools, a COFE Trafford school and Kings road primary, which is a Trafford maintained school. I would also like to consider the Impact on secondary school places and GP surgeries. I am not against the development per-say, but would like to see the issues around the impact on local amenities considered in greater detail.

We believe it is vital to have access to all the site from the north and south. - Will local schools receive extra funding for the increase in pupils?

More council housing is needed to clear the waiting list

The proposal to develop the site for housing cannot be considered in isolation from potential alternative uses. Policy EN10 of the adopted Core Strategy states that proposals on existing open spaces and sport and recreation facilities will only be permitted where the site has been demonstrated to be surplus for its current open space, sport or recreation function and it could not fulfil other unsatisfied open space, sport or recreation needs. - - No evidence has been shown to demonstrate that the playing fields are surplus. Just because the University has no intention to use the site again does not mean that they are surplus. Has any thorough market testing been carried out to identify if any alternative sport or recreation providers are interested in bringing the site back into use? Even if no alternative sport or recreation provider could be identified, the site could satisfy other open space needs. There is high demand for allotments in the area (as recognised in the reasoned justification to Policy EN10), for example. The site also provides valuable wildlife habitat. As the population of the area increases, the need for open space also increases. - - Furthermore, any potential development of the site can be fairly considered without a proper understanding of the ground conditions and their implications. Most of the site was formerly clay pits which were backfilled with unknown fill material. Moreover, the site was originally crossed by watercourses and it is unclear how these were treated during the clay extraction and backfilling and whether they represent a problem for development. Whilst there may be technical solutions to these problems, they should be addressed upfront. The cost of dealing with the ground conditions will significantly affect the viability of any development. Furthermore, solutions such as piling or ground compaction would cause substantial noise and disruption to surrounding dwellings. - - In the unlikely event that the housing proposal passes the test of policy EN10 and can address the poor ground conditions, then I fail to see how "large suburban housing" meets the needs of the area. Any development should provide substantial affordable housing.

Access on Ryebank Road, Longford Road, Nicholas and Newport are already congested the majority of the day and access is greatly restricted in evenings and overnight with current residential parking. Access through from Chorlton to Trafford will create additional traffic as it will be used as a short cut for non-residents. - Current speed restrictions on all surrounding roads is not enforced and additional traffic will mean that the risks of accidents increase. - Local primary and secondary schools are already over-subscribed and no provision has been made for additional school places. This needs to be in place before additional housing is built. - In addition no provision has been made for additional medical and dentist provision. -

This needed to be affordable not luxury housing. Concerned about the traffic that it will build up. - Thank You

The traffic will be very bad more access routes would be needed. Greedy developers - too many dwellings proposed.

There should be eco homes which should be provided by Manchester city council.

It seems likely that developers would prefer one access point on Longford road as this would give the homes a Chorlton postcode (rather than a ryebank Stretford postcode) and they can therefore be sold for a greater price. I think this would cause a great congestion problem on a relatively narrow street (Longford) and would add to difficulties already experienced on surrounding roads during school start / end times, as there are 2 primary schools in close proximity. I don't believe Chorlton has the infrastructure to support this number of new homes as the schools are all over subscribed already, as is our local health care provision. One GP surgery has closed in Chorlton very recently and the existing surgeries struggle to meet demand, as does secondary health care. Chorlton centre is often extremely congested with traffic for long periods during the day and at weekends. Existing housing stock ought to be improved before additional homes are considered.

Too many local traffic problems for additional housing of this scale.

Please do not grant permission

I believe this should be left as parkland.

I would like to know what percentage of the land would be used for social housing? There is a pressing need for this in Manchester? - I would like to press for the homes to be built to the highest environmental specifications as befits houses built in the early 21st century. If they have to be built, something with the smallest environmental footprint. - Worried about car parking

- Chorlton needs more good quality housing stock with off road parking. The properties should use contemporary materials and architecture (to reflect the period of when they are built) rather than attempting to mirror Victorian style.

Is there any way the development can include ways in to ease the traffic congestion associated with St John's School? More cars travelling into/out of a new estate will add to the congestion at commuter times. Possible options to consider: 1. incorporate a school drop-off point adjacent to the school boundary in the new development land. 2. Incorporate Longford Road into a localised one way system. 3. Incorporate school time parking restrictions. 4. Improve cycle and pedestrian routes to/from the school, particularly in the development site. 5 Make access to the site from Ryebank Road (North) only

Section 106 or CIL monies should be used to improve the roads including Peveril Crescent, Sark road and neighbouring areas and also increase tree planting around the area.

This is an interesting consultation that does not allow you to disagree with the plan to build houses, apart from at the beginning. - - And then from there-on in, it presumes you do agree! - - Anyway, this is apparently the box where people are encouraged to put down their thoughts: - - Ryebank Playing Fields are highly valued by the local communities - from runners and walkers, to families, older people and young people. - - It is green space of great importance, in terms of the ecology, wildlife, trees and fauna that co-exist there. To destroy this well established eco system would be a travesty. - - If the proposal is successful, the increase in traffic will be a huge burden to the area, adding enormous stress to the community residing in the nearby areas. Each house will potentially have up to 3 cars. Chorlton is already becoming congested and overcrowded, this is simply going to enhance the congestion, resulting in the area being far less able to cope with the influx of traffic. - - Local schools, doctors (Oswald Rd Medical Practice closed last year) and dentists are already over subscribed so to add more housing and families to this area does not seem to be a very well thought through decision with regards to planning for the future - are new schools also being built? - - I do not think that a through road would be feasible - I do not believe this is being seen as a viable option by Trafford Council, so this proposal (within the survey) is not actually up for discussion - - And finally, this is land that was bequeathed to MMU for sports and recreation as opposed to land bequeathed for selling to build houses and make profit. Ryebank Playing Fields (it is in the name), is much used, hugely loved and respected by the surrounding communities, but once the bulldozers storm in, this special area is destined to be utterly destroyed and obliterated. It is a great pity that we find ourselves living in times where ill thought through decisions are backed purely by a desire for money and wealth. - -

The land should be left as it is with no housing development. It is such a special piece of nature that is much needed in an already congested, densely populated suburb. There are four empty properties with a 1/4 of a mile from the proposed site and these should be used as homes before more houses are built. The environment would benefit so much more to have this land left as it is rather than build. Other solutions should be considered to the housing situation such as not letting people leave properties vacant for considerable lengths of times, like the four I mentioned earlier.

We are most concerned with the extra vehicles that would come down our street (Newport Road) and create yet further pressure on the limited parking. The streets are now becoming increasingly difficult to navigate with both sides (at the Oswald Road end) being fully parked up with no passing possible. - - Can we please have residents only parking at this end of the street and consider limiting it to one car per house - with the second car being parked further down the other end of the street if needed where space is greater (as non-terraced housing). - - The above will also be of great concern with the removal of the parking at the current precinct centre and the addition of new housing there. - - Great that the intention is to bring in more people to Chorlton, but where are they all going to park??

I HAVE NOT ANSWERED QUESTIONS ABOUT THE SPECIFICS OF THE DEVELOPMENT AS I HAVE VEHEMENTLY OPPOSED TO THE SALE OF THIS LAND FOR HOUSING. - - 1. The development summary by Cushman Wakefield is at best misleading when it states that “the site hasn’t been used by the University for many years because of their strategy to relocate to a city centre Campus to provide high quality 21st teaching environments for their students.” This is a false statement as the Council and residents are fully aware that the University has never used this piece of land as a ‘campus’. Local residents and visitors have used the site as a walking, cycling, and pleasure area for around 30 years (I can personally vouch that myself and my children have used it regularly for that period of time). Why has the Council allowed this wording to be used as it may influence those who do not know the history to believe that it is simply a change of business use to residential? Other than put signs up periodically to remind the public that the site belongs to MMU, there has been no investment in the site. In fact, it is the community who maintains the cleaning up of litter from time to time. - 2. The document also states that MMU are selling it so that it can be used for much needed homes. A similar proposal has been made on several occasions over the years, and it is a matter of record, the reasons why the proposal has been refused. There will be documentation in the Council’s records which contain reports as to the reasons why planning permission has been repeatedly refused, including traffic, biodiversity reports etc. The national and local need is for ‘affordable’ and ‘social’ housing. The development framework clearly states the goal is to build 3,4 and 5 bedroom ‘executive’ housing. The definition of executive housing is ... “Executive home is a marketing term for a moderately large and well-appointed house. Such houses were formerly described as mansionettes or bijou residences.” Therefore, it follows that the cost of these houses will be prohibitive to people on average or low incomes or young families. At the local consultation, no-one from either the Council, MMU or the architects was able to confirm how much money would be raised from a Section 106 agreement, nor that any monies raised would be spent on affordable housing. Therefore, there is a precarious social argument that this development would address the social housing crisis. Conversely, the impact of this project on increased traffic, pedestrian safety, pollution, education/health services and quality of life for the local residents will be significant. - 3. Longford, Newport and Nicolas Roads are already highly congested with cars, particularly due to two local primary schools, use of Longord Park (such as athletics, Park run and events). Ryebank Road often has traffic queued as cars attempt to exit onto the very busy Edge Lane. This results in cars using Daresbury and Barway roads as a ‘rat run’. This is likely to increase if the project goes ahead (70 new houses equates to potentially up to 140 cars). This poses major safety issues for local residents – the majority of whom have young children and those who attend the local primary schools and park. - 4. Manchester City Council and MMU have been very honest that they want this Project to go ahead on the basis of a ‘housing need’. The Council and MMU have worked closely together with the Council supporting MMU in acquiring land for city campus buildings. The Council have the power to veto or approve the project – how will the Council prove it is unbiased and ethical in any decisions made. -

Sad to lose the open space, which is a rare and valuable resource. The argument about improving biodiversity is green wash. Will you retain blackberrying? The traffic and parking in the area is already terrible, and makes cycling feel unsafe. Adding 70 houses will make this worse, especially if there is no on road parking in the estate. Chorlton has plenty of 3 bed semis. It could do with more 4 bed semis, but the price for these houses (especially detached) is likely to be too high for locals, and just bring new people to chorlton, adding to pressure in housing rather than reducing it. There will also be huge pressure on school places, with nothing being offered to induce community facilities.

Increased traffic and the environmental impact means this is a proposal I strongly oppose.

i would prefer this to be made into an area of trees only with paths through no houses at all - if there are to be houses there should be affordable and social housing on site - this is just a way to make money and will not benefit local people

We strongly and wholeheartedly disagree with the development. This area should remain a green space. The development will put added pressure on local schools and health care facilities (which are already struggling and over subscribed). The surrounding roads already have an excessive amount of traffic as they also service 2 of the 3 local schools. This will result in further air and noise pollution. We oppose this development on every level. -

Why do you only want large homes on this site? Are people who require smaller homes, either through circumstance (1 or 2 people in the house hold) or for financial reasons not qualifier to have homes with attractive surrounding??? - Young people and older people are often happy to reside in smaller homes. They have fewer cares in an area which is already a traffic nightmare. They still pay council tax. There are large numbers of homes in this area extended to the extreme, now out of reach to the young and old. There are hardly any two bedroom smaller homes, I know I have been looking to down size for a while now. I have sold my larger home which will be occupied by a family and will most likely extend. Where do I go in this area??? NOT A FLAT

This development should not go ahead at all. We should not be losing green space in Chorlton as there has been a huge loss in green space over the years which impacts on the biodiversity of the area. This site should not be developed under any circumstances.

We need social and starter homes if we really have to lose more of the green space we have. Not executive homes which only benefit the well off. A single access road at Longford Road would be a disaster leading to even more congestion and grid locking of the local roads which struggle to cope now. A dual access to the site must be a given.

The traffic situation on Longford Road is already suicide inducing for those of us who live here with the 2 schools. Adding 70 new homes especially with no on street parking for residents/visitors to houses in the new development will make this even worse. The council needs to send someone to attempt to drive down Longford Road at 3.30 pm and witness for themselves the anger and road rage that goes on, people shouting and blowing their horns outside our houses every single day. I fully understand the need for new housing but there is simply not the infrastructure here. At the very least there needs to be access from the firwood side and less houses there. The proposals are not practical and those residents who are unfortunate enough to buy the houses will be subjected to the same traffic hell we face on a daily basis on an even larger scale. I wholeheartedly object to the entire development

It's at a dead end of 2 dead end roads with St. John's school which causes a traffic nightmare at opening and closing times already. Again we lack services in Chorlton - schools, doctors, parking, gym and pool. Therefore need to have access at both ends or Ryebank rd only end. Will need to restrict traffic to prevent cut through traffic. The opposite end of ryebank onto high lane exit is a very dangerous junction as is and adding more traffic will mean it will need to be developed before people are killed. - - Would have been better to have linked to the sports field rather than just making money building houses?

Longford road and surrounding roads are already overcrowded. No new house and no increase in traffic should be considered. The school run triggers road rage incidents every morning and afternoon as it is. The roads are very dangerous and are accidents waiting to happen. People speed down Longford road at 60 mph (the limit is 20mph) and more when cars are parked on either side of the road and there is only room for one car to pass. This is because the road is already used as a cut through. A pedestrian could step out and get run over as the road is not safe. The foot paths are some of the worst maintained in England on Longford road, try pushing a pram down them or walking with someone who visually impaired. All these issues should be tackled but instead you are going to make these issues worse by adding more traffic. - If there has to be houses then they should be a lot less and they should be access from both sides and there should be proper parking access to st Johns school to relieve issues on Longford road during the school run. Houses should be eco friendly. Local residents should benefit from the profit that will be made, personally or with it reinvested in the community. Please make public the names of those who will be making a profit from the scheme.

Chorlton needs new homes and I have no objection to developing this site but it should be for affordable housing for first-time buyers and smaller households. Chorlton already has plenty of large 4+ bed homes that are very expensive and several blocks of 1-bed flats. What is needed is 2 and 3-bedroom houses, with off-street parking, suitable for young families and for older people. - There needs to be more than one access point. Longford Road is already difficult to negotiate - two cars cannot pass each other even in the middle of the day and it becomes impossible to drive down at all around the times that the school day begins and ends. There needs to be an access road that links to the other end of the site juts to allow any traffic to flow at all, but also to avoid creating an 'estate' that goes nowhere which would only attract anti-social behaviour. Create real streets that link with the wider area.

The traffic on Longford Road is a complete nightmare for anyone needing to access the school, this will make it even worse. There simply isn't enough vehicle access to the area to support the proposed development without creating an even worse situation that there is now which is frankly dangerous. It's only a matter of time before a small child is knocked down on the road

The area should be left as it is - a green lung. - If housing has to be built, it should be affordable and council owned. The council always bleats that it cares about residents but in reality, it cares only about money. This land should not be sold off to private landowners.

Longford Road and its parallel road need to become one-way streets. It is unbearable already, given the school traffic. On informal one-way system is already in operation during school rush-hours, so please ensure this is formalised.

ACCESS- There definitely must be access to and from the development both north (Ryebank) and south (Longford) for residents not just for emergency vehicles. The traffic congestion around the school's start and finishing time s and during athletic events at Longford stadium. Getting out of ryebank road south on to edge lane is difficult at most times of the day let alone rush hour. Any incurrence in the traffic from the development will mean the need for traffic lights there. The introduction of one-way system for Longford, Newport and nicolan road will course more problems for residents when looking for parking.

Creating houses in a Victorian vernacular style seems archaic in the 21st Century. I think what most people living in and around Chorlton would like to see would be homes built with ecology in mind, these could be cheaper Scandinavian inspired timber framed structures, that are cheaper to build, have sustainability at their core and are often better designed for more modern living. Some of which could be 2-3 bedroom properties set aside as affordable options for first time buyers. Four and five bedroom expensive 'luxury' homes is not something that Chorlton really needs more of, and ignoring a much needed and already accessible road (Ryebank North) in order to achieve a greater price for the land is both blinkered and greedy.

Whilst the drainage statement alludes to a no flood design, this doesn't go far enough to state that this should prevent overloading the local and wider network during an extreme event + climate change factor. The local and wider surface water drainage network should be modelled in order to determine the impact on over land flows on the natural habitat (Longford Park) as areas of the park already flood during heavy rainfall. - - No through road, and no emergency access as this will become an abused route for vehicles. - - Two Accra points as not to overload the "single lane" traffic routes along the adjoins roads that already are struggling to deal with two way traffic. - - 70 dwellings seems excessive for the area, particularly if these are large properties. And three storeys are also excessive unless the third storey is contained within the apraxia height I.e the loft space. - - Finally an embargo should be put on other university owned land in the area which is currently used by local residents as open green space. Areas such as parts of the meadows that are owned by the university should be protected from development under these plans.

I live very close by on Ryebank Road and bought my house primarily because of it's location. Next to the park, surrounded by trees it is peaceful and safe with very little road traffic (I have a young child) which has helped strengthen it's friendly close knit community whom all take pride in our homes and cherish our privileged surroundings. We all fear that a development of this kind, in particular opening up a through road to Longford Road could jeopardise the reasons we love our tranquil street.

I live on Ryebank Road and have already seen an increase in traffic, often over the speed limit, in recent years, meaning I often fear for the safety of my children. Building more 'high quality' homes will have a direct correlation on the traffic with a realistic estimate of 140 more cars being used on the road. - - I do not think this is acceptable when there is no benefit to the community. This isn't affordable housing which is what is actually needed, it's another way of pushing lower income families out of the area and encouraging more affluent families in, who in turn take the places at the outstanding schools. The area is completely changing and very soon the schools in Chorlton are going to become more and more like private schools with people who can afford to moving to the area to attend them, to the detriment of lower income families. We saw this with Chorlton CofE when they built the new development off Edge Lane - the boundary for intake completely changed. - - I don't feel that this is something that Manchester City Council should be backing.

I think it is ludicrous that you are planning to build all these houses when the traffic around Ryebank/Longford/Newport is so bad at school times or times when there is something on at the park. AND the fact that there is only access from the Chorlton side is ridiculous. I have always been a fan of MCC in the past but in this case you obviously don't care about the residents and are only interested in the money. I strongly oppose this.

The traffic on Longford road cannot cope with this development. The 2 schools + athletics stadium create vast amounts of traffic & congestion which makes this road impassable several times a day, Inc weekends. - A single access point will make pedestrian crossing very dangerous at school times. - No reference to pollution for school children who walk to these 2 schools?? - Local health provision cannot cope; we had a 3 week wait for gp appt, 3 week wait for nurse appt & 10 day wait for phone appt in Sept from Chorlton health centre. More homes will generate more need & it's already under resourced. - This development proposal will make longford road extremely dangerous at these times of the day and it's already impossible for emergency vehicle access.

We oppose any type of development on Ryebank Fields.

The properties should not be sold for buy to let purposes, and only sold to prospective homeowners. There should also be a clause that the properties cannot be divided into separate flats by the owners.

If you provide a condition surely it should be created in a manner that allows for opened of opinion. It appears that 95% of the questions relate to actions that are inevitably going to happen and pays lip service to an honest consultation. - Manchester City Council appear to be prepared to sell it's residents of current neighbourhoods, and it's environmental credentials, down the river, in favour of profit and policy, aligning itself with business rather than supporting it's people. - How does MCC propose to protect it's people from the danger and damage caused by heavy construction vehicles entering and exiting tight residential streets used by amongst others children from two local schools. - How does MCC propose to protect it's people from the disruption to contaminated waste currently buried in the land that is to be 'Developed'. Construction vehicles spreading the contamination through the nearby streets.

I am making an additional submission following meetings of Chorlton Residents Group, during which the following five principles were produced. - - We would like to see a development which: - - • adopts a collaborative and consensual approach to the development of proposals with the voice of the local community at the heart of the process; - • is distinctive and imaginative, embracing innovation in its design and planning whilst responding to the character of the local community and respecting the views of those residents on the perimeter of the site; - • reflects the needs of the local community, providing housing affordable to local people and offering choice in tenure, building size and lifestyle, reflecting Chorlton's historic pattern of mixed scale and use; - • preserves green space and minimises the ecological, environmental and visual impact of the site and recognises its carbon footprint responsibilities; - • makes a positive contribution to the surrounding area in terms of traffic management, drainage, roads and amenities. - - I feel that these principles expand on the points I made on my previous form about the need for a development that is socially/ecologically responsible and beneficial. I am aware that a more detailed proposal from the Chorlton Residents Group will be made available to you. -

Ryebank Fields other feedback and issues - - 1 Age friendly development – Ryebank Fields presents a unique opportunity in Chorlton to include on the site a mix of smaller homes within a larger development to attract local older people. This would support the Council's strategy Housing for an Age Friendly Manchester There are a number of benefits of attracting older people to the site. These include: improved community safety (as many older people are likely to be around during the day), reducing pressure on local schools, creating opportunities for mutual support within the Ryebank Fields and wider community (thus reducing demands on health and social care), keeping the assets of older people within the city and releasing larger family homes on to the market in Chorlton as local older people downsize. - 2 Increased traffic – This is a challenging issue, where the development framework should not be approved in isolation to a wider transport/parking plan for Chorlton centre and other planned housing developments. Factors to be considered include: traffic management and traffic calming measures in the wider area, safe walking routes and drop off for local primary schools, safe walking routes to bus links and the Metrolink, provision for cycling and cycle parking, access for people with mobility issues, facilities that promote car sharing and green measures such as external electric vehicle charging points as standard for all homes. - 3 Sustainable development – There is an opportunity for this to be an exemplar “green” development – built with high standards of thermal insulation, with solar panels, collecting and recycling rainwater, and potentially, because of its scale and mass, creating, storing and redistributing electricity within the development. - 4 Fulfilling MMU's strategic principles and priorities - MMU can build on its reputation as a key strategic partner in the City by helping shape a development (through the sale of the site) that fits with the needs and aspiration of the local community, and contributes to wider strategic objectives, such as building an Age Friendly Manchester and improving sustainability. It is noted that MMU's School of Architecture is a key partner in Manchester's Ambition for Ageing project. This prime site gives MMU the opportunity to publically demonstrate its firm commitment to supporting the development of Manchester as a world class Age Friendly city. - A number of these issues have been shared with local Councillors who are supportive of members of the local community having a greater say in the development of Ryebank Fields. - I am a member of the Chorlton cohousing group for older people who are interested in exploring the possibility of part of the site being suitable for our aspirations. We have plans for the development of six-eco-friendly two bedroomed apartments with garden space and some communal facilities.

1 density - The proposal for 72 dwellings on 4.6ha is too low given the pressure on housing supply. - The existing neighbourhoods have 32 dwelling per hectare (dph) at the Trafford end and 50 dph at the Manchester end. The consultation proposal are for 15 dph - that's the same as suburban LA, even Howard's Garden City aimed at 45dph, Islington and Notting Hill have had over 150dph for a long time. - This is not cramming, this is places with enough people living nearby and animating the streets to make the place feel safe, friendly and desirable. - More people also strengthens the viability of public transport as well as local services within a walking distance. - - 2 access & making the best use of the site for all - If highway access issues are preventing this currently then it would seem better to build appropriately on part of the site and leave the rest as open space either in perpetuity to give better access into the rest of the area or as a meanwhile use until negotiations can allow access to the north and hence the opportunity to finish the neighbourhood - tying the neighbourhoods together - - 3 a better kind of value - The thoughts illustrated here show 270 houses, even more homes could be created if flats were added to the mix. 72 Band A homes is only going to bring in a fraction of the income to the council of what is here, even if only half of it were built - - 4 improve the security of the neighbourhood and Longford Park - The development here can also make the park safer to use. An exclusive inward looking development of homes for the wealthy is both going to attract crime and ignore the opportunity to reduce it in the park with more windows facing onto it by the reality and perception of greater supervision. 3 storey 'villa' blocks along the park would increase the distance of this supervision as well as allow further views from the houses on the other side of the street.

I live at the Ryebank Rd end of Newport Road. These three roads are already heavily congested and are rat runs. No local people want this development. Please leave Ryebank Fields and the natural habitat well alone!.

I am disappointed that the survey is not well designed. It does not give scope for residents to say they do not agree with any of the listed options in some sections. I think it would also be better to have comments boxes at the bottom of each section, rather than putting all extra comments at the back. However it is good that you have given space for as many extra comments as we wish to make. - - - I feel that Ryebank Fields represent a unique opportunity for a new type of socially and environmentally responsible development which reinforces the diversity and dynamism of the neighbourhood and preserves green space. I feel that the current proposals do not reflect the needs or character of the existing community and will have an unacceptable impact on local services and traffic as well as the immediate environment. I would like to see a development which has as its basic principles: - • a collaborative and consensual approach to the development of proposals with the voice of the local community at the heart of the process; - • is distinctive and imaginative, embracing innovation in its design and planning whilst responding to the character of the local community and respecting the views of those residents on the perimeter of the site; - • reflects the needs of the local community, providing housing affordable to local people and offering choice in tenure, building size and lifestyle, reflecting Chorlton's historic pattern of mixed scale and use; - • preserves green space and minimises the ecological, environmental and visual impact of the site and recognises its carbon footprint responsibilities; - • make a positive contribution to the surrounding area in terms of traffic management, drainage, roads and amenities. - - Some of my detailed ideas are below. - The Development Framework has a good overall layout, with plenty of greenery and integration into Longford Park. - - Assuming the traffic issues can be resolved satisfactorily: - - Instead of standard housing design this development could be imaginative, innovative, distinctive, creative, in keeping with and enhancing the fairly unique character of Chorlton. It could be environmentally friendly with design excellence in line with the NPPF - - I propose a development of eco houses which are as near carbon neutral as possible. These could be Scandinavian style, mainly timber, possibly modular construction. They would be well insulated, have sustainable energy sources, and possibly water recycling features. - - This is in accord with The Manchester Strategy 'Our Manchester' and the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 This would also help towards the council's stated aims of carbon reduction of 44 % by 2020 (Manchester Core Strategy) and 100% clean energy city by 2050. Another stated aim in the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 is to be at the forefront on environmental initiatives and mitigating climate change. - - This development could also act as a beacon for other new developments. - - People taking up the opportunity to live in an eco house will have less cars per household than most families in non eco homes, and many will choose not to have cars at all, thus reducing the increase in traffic. - - It should be a mix of reasonably priced 2 bed, including some one storey, 3 and 4 bed homes. This would enable the development to cater for a mix of households, including families but also older local residents who want to downsize, but want to stay in the area and do not want to live in an apartment. This is in line with the Manchester Core Strategy on low carbon lifestyles. It would also reduce the need for extra school places. - - The 2 bed homes could be designed to take up no more space than a large detached house, and not contribute to housing density, whilst maintaining a high level of Council Tax Income, and would most likely have at most one car per dwelling, whereas large detached family houses would probably have several cars. Older people, especially those retired, would not generally be going out in cars at peak/school run times again alleviating traffic problems. - - 2 bed homes for local residents downsizing, would release family size housing, including 3 to 5 bed houses and possibly even bigger ones, for others to buy. At the moment there is no real opportunity for this. Most of the apartments suitable for older residents in Chorlton are also well away from public transport. - - It should also cater for some specially adapted properties for disabled people. - I would also encourage the houses to meet the London space standards as a minimum, to allow comfortable living spaces for all and for houses to meet the Lifetime Homes standards, to ensure that they are future proofed and convertible for those with limited mobility issue or disabilities. - - These would help fulfil the objectives in the NPPF and Manchester Core Strategy which state the need for high quality small units. - - The development should also be mixed tenure some owner occupier, including affordable homes, and some social housing for rent. This would be better for the area than having all expensive housing in one development and concentrate affordable and social rented housing in the other proposed developments. Now the rules have been relaxed on borrowing and funding for Housing Associations it is possible for them to build without relying on s106 money. - At the moment there is a good mix in the area of large semidetached houses and smaller terraces, which gives a more balanced community. - - This again is in accord with The Manchester Strategy 'Our Manchester', Manchester Core Strategy and Residential Growth strategy and the NPPF. It is also in line with Manchester Residential Quality Guidance, Providing for Housing Choice Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance. - - If the above ideas are incorporated in the development I think MMU would be leaving a positive legacy in the area. It would also be in keeping with their mission statements include commitments to sustainability, partnership working and community engagement. I note that MMU is a key partner in promoting Manchester as an age friendly city. I would urge MMU as landowner to put these admirable strategic principles into practice and fully engage with the residents of Chorlton to help to deliver a development, alongside a responsible developer, that all stakeholders can be proud of. - - I would encourage the landowner and developer to make the response to climate change a central feature of the development's character. The appetite for environmentally conscious living is strong in this area and sustainable housing would be seen as a key selling point for future residents. - - I understood that MMU has recently been awarded the status of greenest university in the country. This is an outstanding achievement and one that clearly demonstrates the University's commitment to sustainable behaviour and development. This commitment to high environmental standards is shared by local residents. Chorlton is well known for its environment-conscious population and a development that reflected that community mindset would be very popular with the people who already live in Chorlton and those looking to move here. - - I therefore strongly encourage MMU to focus on engaging with a development partner or partners who share this commitment to genuinely sustainable development. -

1 Age friendly development – Ryebank Fields presents a unique opportunity in Chorlton to include on the site a mix of smaller homes within a larger development to attract local older people. This would support the Council's strategy Housing for an Age Friendly Manchester. There are a number of benefits of attracting older people to the site. These include: improved community safety (as many older people are likely to be around during the day), reducing pressure on local schools, creating opportunities for mutual support within the Ryebank Fields and wide community (thus reducing demands on health and social care), keeping the assets of older people within the city and releasing larger family homes on to the market in Chorlton as local older people downsize.

2 Increased traffic – This is a challenging issue, where the development framework should not be approved in isolation to a wider transport/parking plan for Chorlton centre and other planned housing developments. Factors to be considered include: traffic management and traffic calming measures in the wider area, safe walking routes and drop off for local primary schools, safe walking routes to bus links and the Metrolink, provision for cycling and cycle parking, access for people with mobility issues, facilities that promote car sharing and green measures such as external electric vehicle charging points as standard for all homes.

3 Sustainable development – There is an opportunity for this to be an exemplar “green” development – built with high standards of thermal insulation, with solar panels, collecting and recycling rainwater, and potentially, because of its scale and mass, creating, storing and redistributing electricity within the development.

4 Fulfilling MMU's strategic principles and priorities - MMU can build on its reputation as a key strategic partner in the City by helping shape a development (through the sale of the site) that fits with the needs and aspiration of the local community, and contributes to wider strategic objectives, such as building an Age Friendly Manchester and improving sustainability. It is noted that MMU's School of Architecture is a key partner in Manchester's Ambition for Ageing project. This prime site gives MMU the opportunity to publically demonstrate its firm commitment to supporting the development of Manchester as a world class Age Friendly city.

A number of these issues have been shared with local Councillors who are supportive of members of the local community having a greater say in the development of Ryebank Fields.

I am a member of the Chorlton cohousing group for older people who are interested in exploring the possibility of part of the site being suitable for our aspirations. We have plans for the development of six-eco-friendly two bedroomed apartments with garden space and some communal facilities. Contact details: s1 Age friendly development – Ryebank Fields presents a unique opportunity in Chorlton to include on the site a mix of smaller homes within a larger development to attract local older people. This would support the Council's strategy Housing for an Age Friendly Manchester. There are a number of benefits of attracting older people to the site. These include: improved community safety (as many older people are likely to be around during the day), reducing pressure on local schools, creating opportunities for mutual support within the Ryebank Fields and wide community (thus reducing demands on health and social care), keeping the assets of older people within the city and releasing larger family homes on to the market in Chorlton as local older people downsize.

2 Increased traffic – This is a challenging issue, where the development framework should not be approved in isolation to a wider transport/parking plan for Chorlton centre and other planned housing developments. Factors to be considered include: traffic management and traffic calming measures in the wider area, safe walking routes and drop off for local primary schools, safe walking routes to bus links and the Metrolink, provision for cycling and cycle parking, access for people with mobility issues, facilities that promote car sharing and green measures such as external electric vehicle charging points as standard for all homes.

3 Sustainable development – There is an opportunity for this to be an exemplar “green” development – built with high standards of thermal insulation, with solar panels, collecting and recycling rainwater, and potentially, because of its scale and mass, creating, storing and redistributing electricity within the development.

4 Fulfilling MMU's strategic principles and priorities - MMU can build on its reputation as a key strategic partner in the City by helping shape a development (through the sale of the site) that fits with the needs and aspiration of the local community, and contributes to wider strategic objectives, such as building an Age Friendly Manchester and improving sustainability. It is noted that MMU's School of Architecture is a key partner in Manchester's Ambition for Ageing project. This prime site gives MMU the opportunity to publically demonstrate its firm commitment to supporting the development of Manchester as a world class Age Friendly city.

A number of these issues have been shared with local Councillors who are supportive of members of the local community having a greater say in the development of Ryebank Fields.

I am a member of the Chorlton cohousing group for older people who are interested in exploring the possibility of part of the site being suitable for our aspirations. We have plans for the development of six-eco-friendly two bedroomed apartments with garden space and some communal facilities.

Cycle routes should be largely separated from traffic and encourage the development of Rye Bank Rd as a primary cycle route, mainly vehicle free. Secondly a low traffic pedestrian route to Firwood metro station would encourage use of public transport and make walking healthier.

Don't build more houses in what is already an overcrowded area. You will make the roads more dangerous and this should be of importance to you as there are so many schools close by. Lots of people already use that green space of which we have few enough of already. People also take their dogs there to do their business and if you build on that site you will force the dog poo problem to move to Longford Park and the put more children at risk. Please instead build new houses on the green spaces surrounding the investors in this project homes. Please also publish information about who stands to gain financially from this development. If you have to build on this site the please think of the children and build half as many house, please also make the houses as eco-friendly and sustainable as possible. Please beforehand address the problem of road rage caused on Longford Road from the school run. Please also fix the pavements on Longford Road before you build more house. They are some of the worst pavements in Manchester.

It is good that you are including some larger houses, i.e. 5 bed houses as there is a shortage of these in the area and many households are increasing in size again due to young people not being able to afford to leave home and people looking after older relatives.

However, I was concerned to see that you don't seem to have included any affordable houses within the scheme. Chorlton is a very expensive area and there should be provision for younger families/first time buyers etc. as well as executive homes for the better off. I'd expected to see some social housing provision to be part of the scheme as a social responsibility obligation.

Traffic flow and parking are massive problems on the streets to the south of the scheme - Longford, Newport and Nicholas roads in particular. The proposal to have access ONLY from Longford Rd would be totally unacceptable for this reason. I would also like to see a proposal added to the development plans to improve parking and traffic flow on those roads, for example to make them one way streets (with traffic calming features to stop speeding) and to find a way to maximise parking e.g. with marked parking spaces (if there is evidence that this increases the efficiency of parking).

Chose the Option 2 in the layout section because the only cars entering the actual housing area should be those belonging to residents and their visitors. It also has the fewest roads running alongside and through the development which feels safer for children who may play outside. Also, if it is going to be a route through from one side of Ryebank Road to the other then traffic should not be directed through the estate it should be directed past it.

The drawings have fewer than 70 houses built on the plot, more like 50 in each illustrative framework, which is more like it as this appears to have more green space surrounding each property. That is what should happen so that the development is sympathetic to the nearby park and keeps some element of openness rather than feeling like a packed in housing estate. In terms of style, as long as new houses are going to stand the test of time rather than become unfashionable, then they can still be modern and/or in keeping with the Victorian roads that they fall become part of. That can be looked at further as part of the planning process and on the Manchester.gov.uk planning portal if the development does go ahead.

However, my main issue with this development is not the style nor the layout nor the number of houses being built, but that any new residents will add to the pressure and congestion on the surrounding roads. They were never designed to take large numbers of vehicles and mostly have no room to create off street parking, so they already have issues with extra cars parking up and blocking the narrow roads around school run times, which will only get worse. Cars can't be allowed to become a rat run for Manchester United traffic short-cutting to/from Chorlton either.

The existing access and parking in those roads needs to be resolved if there are going to be extra residents on Ryebank Road. As does the lack of car parking that will be available with the redevelopment of Chorlton precinct and the extra traffic that will be caused if more people travel in from outside the area to shop there and park up in the surrounding roads as well. Whether travelling by car or by bus, the congestion on all of the access roads (Barlow Moor, Wilbraham, Edge Lane) is also and already terrible, which we have long since believed to be the made worse by the poorly positioned bus stops and lack of pull-in access for buses along most of the routes through Chorlton that causes everything else to snarl-up due to the single lanes to drive through it.

There is potential to get rid of some of the bus stops altogether, as they are so close by, like one further towards Olive and Thyme in the layby would suffice rather than one at each end of the relatively short row of shops between Santander and Duffys where through and turning traffic gets 'stuck' behind the parked up buses so often. Compare this to the opposite side of the road, where this is just one stop in the same area, between the terminus and outside Jasmine and across to the other side of the lights at the precinct, which has been like that forever. It has just become problematic and more congested since the layby for the bus has been removed from that side of the road.

The Ryebank Road housing development also causes concern about how the local area will cope with the extra requirement for extra school places and local services such as the doctor and dentist etc. These are already full to capacity and existing Chorlton residents are suffering as a result. Unless there is going to be extra support or provision in these areas outside of those that already exist then the Ryebank Road development will again only make living in Chorlton worse.

If it does go ahead, we feel there should be a full range of house prices on the Ryebank Road development, as the

recent developments on Darley Avenue provided relatively small starter homes and the conversion of the old Freemasons Hall was just too expensive for many people. What about the price range in between and something that those living in a semi in Chorlton might move to as well as affordable housing and some more expensive properties for those that can afford it? There should be new housing for everyone in Chorlton seeing as new houses are so rarely built in this area.

Overall so much is expensive in this area simply because it is 'Chorlton' but we are not all well off, and in many ways it feels like the council has taken us for granted, as we are quite the 'cash cow' but get little in the way of investment and improvement in the issues that already exist. By all means build the housing development on Ryebank Road but please please make sure that everything else as mentioned above is fixed first. Thank you.

I feel strongly that we mustn't miss this opportunity to create more mixed housing where there could be units for (older people as well as younger families) who wish to down size from their properties and yet stay in the heart of Chorlton - along with some kind of community/ activity centre built in - for round and old alike. This would be socially very positive and also assess crime / safety issues as the diversity of residents would mean different usage at different times

I am extremely concerned about the impact on traffic, particularly on Longford Road at school time when it is more or less impossible to drive down the road. I disagree that the area should be developed at all, but if it does, there should definitely be car access from the north side as this would share the burden. I am extremely saddened that we will lose this precious piece of green space and think it risks jeopardising the unique charm of Chorlton through over crowding.

The questions in the survey did not address many of the important issues I would like to see addressed in relation to this proposed development. It did not ask what kind of homes I feel should be built there. Much has been said about the building of executive homes selling at high prices, I would be more sympathetic to a development that built affordable homes for people from the area who are being priced out of living in the area. The survey does not touch upon the traffic issues that the development will cause for residents on Longford Road - firstly while the building takes place, and also with parking. Traffic on Longford Road is already a nightmare, this will make the situation worse.

Longford Road is already a very busy road with two schools along its length. Careful consideration needs to be made of traffic management and road safety. In line with this, I believe that 70 additional houses to the area is far too many. I feel that the infrastructure of the area will be strained and this would put pressure on local schools. Chorlton currently does not have adequate local amenities such as the fact we now have no leisure centre. In my opinion the proposed development appears to be for the elite, wealthy incomers to the area. This does not seem to provide residences that are likely to be afforded by local people. I do not believe that the area needs any more housing and certainly not three storey, 5 bed houses. Given the fact that the long roads of Longford and surrounding roads are so built up, the best use of the site would be as recreational land with better, safer community access.

Hi there,

My partner and I live just off Longford Rd. While I am really sad to think about the wildness of the Man Met meadow area being lost (I work from home and often go for a walk there in the afternoon), I am also quite pragmatic about the need to build new homes and the potential council tax capital this may provide for the council and thus for the local area. I am also aware, however, how many of my neighbours (particularly those on Longford Rd) are understandably very concerned.

The things I would like the council to consider seriously are:

- 1) Traffic congestion on Longford Rd: With two schools nearby, Longford Rd and the roads around it can get really crowded. The entrance to the new development would have to be managed very carefully. I suspect I'm not qualified to make these assessments, but it strikes me that having two entrances to the development would be better than having only a Longford Rd entrance.
- 2) A guarantee that none of the houses on the development site would ever need to park on Longford Rd.
- 3) Ecological concerns: Retain as many mature trees as possible. Wherever possible look to maintain biodiversity and keep a 'green-ness' to the plans.
- 4) The council would need to ensure local services could cope. Friends with kids who live locally tell me that school spaces etc can be difficult to secure.

A number of residents have put together the below given their concerns on the proposed redevelopment. I hope these concerns are taken seriously:

Ryebank Fields alternative proposals – basic principles

As Chorlton residents, we feel that Ryebank Fields represent a unique opportunity for a new type of socially and environmentally responsible development which reinforces the diversity and dynamism of the neighbourhood and preserves green space. We feel that the current proposals do not reflect the needs or character of the existing community and will have an unacceptable impact on local services and traffic as well as the immediate environment. We would like to see a development which:

- adopts a collaborative and consensual approach to the development of proposals with the voice of the local community at the heart of the process;
- is distinctive and imaginative, embracing innovation in its design and planning whilst responding to the character of the local community and respecting the views of those residents on the perimeter of the site;
- reflects the needs of the local community, providing housing affordable to local people and offering choice in tenure, building size and lifestyle, reflecting Chorlton's historic pattern of mixed scale and use;
- preserves green space and minimises the ecological, environmental and visual impact of the site and recognises its carbon footprint responsibilities;
- make a positive contribution to the surrounding area in terms of traffic management, drainage, roads and amenities.

Your survey questions are too leading!

In principle, I have no major objection. However, I think the following are essential:

- 1) Off-road parking for a residence - for more than one car as they are 3-5 bedroom houses.
- 2) Traffic calming measures introduced on Longford Road. There is a school on this road and drivers already race down the road. Speed bumps would be essential with the extra traffic flow.
- 3) The biodiversity of the existing site should be preserved as much as possible.

I am generally opposed to a housing development on the site. I'd much prefer a community use for the site. If feel that any development should retain trees to help retain the character of Rye Bank rd and park square to the north. It should also give good access for pedestrians and cyclists. Physical measures should be put in place to prevent motor cyclists using any cycle route. I am very strongly opposed to vehicular access from the north. Such access would dramatically change the character of the cul de sac part of Rye Bank rd adjoining the site. It would inconvenience the residents of Park Square and Rye bank rd and this would offset any convenience for residents of the new development. One person's loss being another's gain. Furthermore any increase in traffic on Greatstone Rd would increase pressure on an already busy road an particularly on the junction of Manchester rd and Kensington rd, which is already a terrible junction. A through route between the two halves of Rye Bank Rd would create a rat run and have a massively negative impact on the residents of Firewood and Kensington rd etc.

As a resident of Ryebank Road to the south, I am against any development of this site, as it is a natural area and used by many local people as a recreational space.

Having attended one of the meetings that was held at Oswald School and having spoken to the representatives there from several departments I still have serious concerns with any plans to build on this site.

The most worrying was that the preferred option is Option 4 with a single entrance on Longford Road. Not for any other reason than it would allow houses on that site to have a M21 postcode and generate more profit, which I find to be an appalling reason.

Any option with the sole entrance being on Longford Road, or the junction of Longford Road with Ryebank Road will be hazardous, adding to the existing chaos on these roads and adjacent roads at peak traffic times including school run times. As it is, I do not leave my house at these times if I can help it, due to the number of cars using Ryebank Road, making it difficult and dangerous for me to leave or enter my driveway. Surely the safest option is to have 2 separate entrances, one to the South and one to the North, that do not connect.

While I would prefer the field not to be built on, if building was to happen, 70 houses is far too many. 70 executive houses, with 2 - 3 cars per household could potentially mean over 150 extra cars on already busy roads. While the gentleman at the meeting said not every household would use cars, I have found that most people in executive house tend to use cars to get to work, and certainly is the case with most of my neighbours.

The other concern with 70 houses is the added pressure that puts on the schools and GP practises here that are already full.

The field also contains wildlife, and allowances must be made for that.

Regarding parking on the roads on the proposed development, to not have road parking will again add to the already awful parking situation on Ryebank Road. Parking on Ryebank Road is already at full capacity, Ryebank Road not only has to support the residents of Ryebank Road, but has over spill from the adjacent roads as well as those attending events at Longford Track and Longford Park.

Any development must take into account the impact it will have on traffic and parking on nearby roads, as it is already dangerous with the number of cars, many ignoring the speed measure that exist.

I am aware that a group of residents held a meeting and I support their views that any development:

- adopts a collaborative and consensual approach to the development of proposals with the voice of the local community at the heart of the process;
- is distinctive and imaginative, embracing innovation in its design and planning whilst responding to the character of the local community and respecting the views of those residents on the perimeter of the site;
- reflects the needs of the local community, providing housing affordable to local people and offering choice in tenure, building size and lifestyle, reflecting Chorlton's historic pattern of mixed scale and use;
- preserves green space and minimises the ecological, environmental and visual impact of the site and recognises its carbon footprint responsibilities;
- make a positive contribution to the surrounding area in terms of traffic management, drainage, roads and amenities."

The proposal is not in character with the existing local housing; most is two storey semi/terrace in straight road frontage.

This is Chorlton; not Wilmslow.

The statement about access and location is misleading; There is a Ryebank Road at both ends; this will cause confusion over the consultation process.

This is at present a lovely area of wildlife with a diverse and thriving eco-system. This will be lost if this happens. The number of trees self populating is a major step in the Governments target to increase tree numbers in city and towns. This will be lost if this development happens.

The area provides a diverse range of habitats from established woodland, new saplings, bushes and grass meadows. It is in marked contrast to the mown grass and municiple planting in the adjacent council area.

The land was gifted to a college that was later amalgamated into what is now MMU with the express condition that the land was for recreation and leisure. This should be protected to ensure that the value of bequests is not undermined.

The development is to maximise sale proceeds for the MMU to help pay their over paid Vice Chancellor and other senior staff inflated salaries and benefits. Planning and councils should concentrate on what the area needs; not what developers and fat cats want.

Any link road through the development will be used as a rat run in order to avoid conjection in the established main routes. This will increase road traffic in adjacent residential roads with increased risk to pedestrians and cyclists.

Chorlton is already full of houses and flats. It is not desperate for more. There are ample brown field sites within walking distance of Chorlton that could be developed.

It needs space for people to walk and play. It needs the biodiversity. It needs fields that dogs can be walked in that are fun environments (unlike the green mown wasteland of the Trafford Park).

It does not need a posh tory enclave. It does not need more multi car homes causing more congestion and pollution.

I am absolutely opposed to the development of this site.

1) Loss of a Wonderful Green Space Used by the Community

Ryebank field is a lovely green space. I walk here most days and always see other people walking here. It feels really wild, almost like you are in the countryside even though you are in the heart of Manchester. It is covered in wild flowers in the summer. In August and September families come blackberry picking. It has been described as “the gem of Chorlton” and rightly so.

This is a quiet corner of Chorlton and it would absolutely change the character of the area to put a housing development here.

Ryebank Field is much nicer than the adjacent Longford Park (much of the grass areas of Longford park are waterlogged and semi-submerged under water for much of the year making them unpleasant to walk on).

It would be a huge loss to the community if this wonderful space was sold off, particularly at a time when Trafford Council is proposing to sell off part of the nearby Turn Moss Playing Fields. If both go through this would adversely impact on the available green space in the area which would greatly affect the amenity of the area.

The proposal suggests that extra trees would be put in and that the development would be in a “Parkland Setting.” It may be dressed up in this way but the simple reality is it will be a housing development where much of the green space is built over and the majority of any retained green space will be in the form of private gardens. It cannot replace a wonderful field.

2) Impact on Traffic

I note that the current proposal favours the only access point being via Longford Road.

Although this part of Chorlton is normally quiet, Longford Road already suffers from serious traffic congestion, particularly in rush hour and at school opening and closing time. This is due to:

- (a) The fact that it is narrow so there is insufficient room for two cars to pass each other
- (b) The proximity of two schools –St Johns RC Primary school and Oswald Road school.

Oswald Road can also become congested for the same reason.

For anyone heading into Manchester City Centre by car in the morning from the proposed development the natural route to take would be to go up Longford Road towards Oswald Road. This would add to the congestion. Alternatively they might cut up Newport Road (which runs parallel to Longford Road). This extra traffic could cause the same problems on Newport Road that people currently have on Longford Road (Newport Road is a similarly narrow road with insufficient room for two cars to pass and Oswald Road School is at the top of Newport Road).

The proposed houses are 3-5 bedroomed houses – realistically these are likely to be purchased by families who operate at least two vehicles.

I think it is also worth noting that currently many children walk to school through the park then up Longford Road directly passed the proposed access point. At the moment they do not have to cross a street to do this.

3) Impact on School Places

The proposal is for 3-5 bedroomed houses. It seems likely that many of these houses would be purchased by families with school age children. The schools in Chorlton are already full up. This will put huge pressure on school places, particularly for local schools such as Oswald Road School and St Johns RC Primary School.

I haven't seen any proposals for how the council plans to deal with this.

4) Noise

This corner of Chorlton is currently very quiet. Although there are problems with congestion on Longford Road due to the schools, happily this is mainly in school/peak hours.

Adding a development – putting houses on a quiet a green space and the additional traffic they will generate would

really change the character of this part of Chorlton.

I am also concerned about the noise and traffic caused by the building of the development itself –particularly if the only access point is over Longford Road.

5) “Much Needed Housing”

As much as this has been promoted as creating “much needed housing” the reality is that the proposed builds are not for social or even affordable housing. They are for 3-5 bedroomed semi detached and detached houses with gardens which no doubt would come with a large price tag in a area like Chorlton.

There are plenty of areas in Manchester and Trafford which could be developed for housing which do not involve ruining a wonderful green space.

6) The Consultation Questionnaire

I do have some real issues with the. questionnaire For example at question 2 it asks for a preferred option but does not provide an option of “no development” It seems heavily slanted in this way.

Similarly questions 5-10 appear to be heavily loaded in favour of granting the planning permission. An example of this is that “landscape’ it asks whether the proposal will create a parkland setting for the new houses. Yet no where under “landscape” is there a question about whether the proposed development will alter the wild landscape we already have which in enjoyed by many members of the community. Another example is the question about planting new trees and whether this will strengthen the existing tree belt with the park. This is a complete nonsense as there is no balancing question about the impact of all of the other trees that will be felled or the fact that enjoyment of the existing tree belt will be greatly curtailed by having a large housing development next to it.

It reads like a document that has been designed, not to consult, but to ask limited questions to try to engineer the “right” responses to aid the granting of planning permission.

I also feel that the questionnaire is unclear as to whether it is asking people if they agree with design principles or whether they agree that the proposed development meets these design principles.

I feel that the options presented do not represent a genuine consultation. The critical decisions about numbers, sizes and type of housing appear to have already been taken and we are only being asked about which arrangement we would prefer. I am not against development necessarily but not of this kind. Along with a group of residents I would ask MMU and MCC to adopt the following key principles in pursuing the development of this site.

As Chorlton residents, we feel that Ryebank Fields represent a unique opportunity for a new type of socially and environmentally responsible development which reinforces the diversity and dynamism of the neighbourhood. We feel that the current proposals do not reflect the needs or character of the existing community and will have an unacceptable impact on local services and traffic as well as the immediate environment. We would like to see a development which:

- adopts a collaborative and consensual approach to the development of proposals with the voice of the local community at the heart of the process;
 - is distinctive and imaginative, embracing innovation in its design and planning whilst responding to the character of the local community;
 - reflects the needs of the local community, providing affordable housing and offering choice in tenure, building size and lifestyle, reflecting Chorlton’s historic pattern of mixed scale and use;
 - minimises the ecological, environmental and visual impact of the site and recognises its carbon footprint responsibilities;
- ensures that house density and building design make a positive contribution to the surrounding area, respecting the views of those residents on the site perimeter.

I don't agree with building on this site whatsoever but it be converted into playing fields for local schools and community to use.

70 extra houses will create too much strain on local resources. School places are already at a premium as is the local health centre. If you build houses, you need the necessary resources built to support these extra families and this is not in your plans.

Traffic is already difficult on Longford Road and the surrounding streets. The extra traffic would be unsupportable. Plus access to Edge Lane would mean tailbacks up Ryebank Road to the south.

I do not support this.

It is a shame there is no mechanisms for considering the development of Chorlton holistically.

There are several assumptions underlying the questions here.

1. that the land should be built on - it is a vital area of green space and biodiversity - what other ideas for its use as green space have been considered? There is no green options analysis presented.

2. that there is a need for elite homes. I cannot see any justification for building a high income ghetto, where the demand on housing in Chorlton is for affordable homes - there are plenty of large, expensive homes available. How do these plans fit with GM Spatial framework (well, they cannot, as the framework is currently under revision). Where is at least a allocation of affordable and social housing in this development?

3. that existing infrastructure can support, not just the number of dwellings, but the anticipated number of people in such a development. There would be increased pressure on schools, health services that would be difficult to accommodate (especially alongside all the other residential developments in the pipeline such as Maudsley House, the Manchester Rd site etc)

It was disappointing not to see any reference to the Climate Change strategy or commitment to zero carbon construction and building maintenance. Surely these considerations should be of prime importance? Given MMU's outstanding leadership in this area, I would have expected them to be concerned about the carbon neutrality of developments on land they sell.

it was also disappointing not to see a commitment to homes for life design - all units need to be suitable for disabled and ageing people. There can be no justification for a high income, able bodied ghetto.

It was good to see mention of cyclists and pedestrians, but unless the development explicitly designs out cars, it will still be unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians. even if the paths through the development are well designed, surrounding streets are choked with cars and unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians - increased traffic from the development can only make this situation worse.

The traffic on Longford Road is already at breaking point 3 times a day (St Johns School) and the impact of access only from the Longford Rd end needs more research. Chorlton infrastructure (schools, health centre etc) cannot support hundreds of extra families (incl new proposed residents to the precinct). The schools (incl 2 immediate schools) are already at capacity. More affordable housing would be preferable to luxury housing which is not needed in Chorlton, wanted or not.

Please accept these comments in submission to the public consultation for the proposed development at Ryebank Road.

As a Chorlton resident, I feel that Ryebank Fields represent a unique opportunity for a socially and environmentally responsible development which reinforces the diversity and dynamism of the neighbourhood.

The current proposals do not reflect the needs or distinctive character of the Chorlton community and will have an unacceptable impact on local services and traffic as well as the immediate environment. I would like to see a development which:

- adopts a collaborative and consensual approach to the development of proposals with the voice of the local community at the heart of the process;
- is distinctive and imaginative, embracing innovation in its design, planning and construction whilst responding to the character of the local community and respecting the views of those residents on the perimeter of the site;
- reflects the needs of the local community, providing housing affordable to local people and offering choice in tenure, building size and lifestyle, reflecting Chorlton's historic pattern of mixed scale and use;
- preserves green space and minimises the ecological, environmental and visual impact of the site and recognises its carbon footprint responsibilities;
- makes a positive contribution to the surrounding area in terms of traffic management, drainage and amenities.

I look forward to hearing more about the proposed development in the future.

Three out of four of the proposals actually suggest entering any proposed housing development from Ryebank Road Firswood, which is part of Trafford MBC. This would be unacceptable to residents of Ryebank Road Trafford as we are not part of Chorlton and do not see why we should have to provide access onto the site for a development of houses in Chorlton. We already have traffic issues of our own relating to Man Utd and Lancashire Cricket ground when the area is heavily congested and in the last 2 years we have become a permit zone due to the intense traffic and parking pressures on match and concert days. We also have several schools in the locality, one directly on Ryebank Road and one just off it.

Furthermore, the proposals also suggest the very negative possibility of opening Ryebank Road up between Manchester and Trafford as an option. This would be a total disaster leading to a 'rat run' between Edge Lane and into Trafford and makes no sense whatsoever. This possibility would be actively opposed by anyone already living in the area and would also make any potential housing development unattractive in terms of heavy traffic and road safety. Anyone looking to buy an expensive new family home on the development site is not going to be attracted by a major back route running right through it for commuters, football and cricket match attendees and everyone else looking for a quick way to bypass other congested areas locally.

Three out of four of the proposals actually suggest entering any proposed housing development from Ryebank Road Firswood, which is part of Trafford MBC. This would be unacceptable to residents of Ryebank Road Trafford as we are not part of Chorlton and do not see why we should have to provide access onto the site for a development of houses in Chorlton. We already have traffic issues of our own relating to Man Utd and Lancashire Cricket ground when the area is heavily congested and in the last 2 years we have become a permit zone due to the intense traffic and parking pressures on match and concert days. We also have several schools in the locality, one directly on Ryebank Road and one just off it.

Furthermore, the proposals also suggest the very negative possibility of opening Ryebank Road up between Manchester and Trafford as an option. This would be a total disaster leading to a 'rat run' between Edge Lane and into Trafford and makes no sense whatsoever. This possibility would be actively opposed by anyone already living in the area and would also make any potential housing development unattractive in terms of heavy traffic and road safety. Anyone looking to buy an expensive new family home on the development site is not going to be attracted by a major back route running right through it for commuters, football and cricket match attendees and everyone else looking for a quick way to bypass other congested areas locally.

We are a group of 6 older home owners who see the benefit of selling our larger three and four bedroomed family homes in Chorlton and having smaller, more accessible, energy efficient homes. Chorlton is a mixed age community but there are no specific proposals for mixed residential housing in the Ryebank or Precinct plans. We are very interested in being part of either development.

We are looking for a block of six self-contained two-bedroom flats with a shared garden and some shared indoor communal space where we can live near each other for mutual support as we get older. We would like to include design features that allow, over time, for adaptations for people with restricted mobility. At present, there is no opportunity locally for older people to create their own community. Cohousing fosters communal support rather than isolated elderly people's housing; and will, by people helping each other more, save on health and social care costs in the future. .

On the Ryebank site the proposed outline plans for one block of two 4 or 5 bedroom houses would be more than we would need for 6 flats and would be offset by 6 family houses coming on the market in Chorlton. A building for elderly could be in the same architectural style as other properties. We would often be around during the day with benefits for community safety and would not put pressure on the adjacent oversubscribed school.

We are currently formed as a limited company Chorlton Cohousing Company Ltd, and are part of a national co-housing network. (<https://cohousing.org.uk>) We are very interested in speaking to the Council, the land owners, architects and developers about our ideas. We would want our proposal to fit in with the wider redevelopment plans and incorporate the best in innovative eco-friendly construction. Our contact is chorltoncohousing@gmail.com

The development framework summary sets out 4 options for the proposed development. Options 1,2 and 3 all propose vehicular and pedestrian access to this site from Rye Bank Road, Stretford.

The present nature of Rye Bank Road, Stretford is a cul-de-sac that terminates with a pedestrian entrance to Longford Park and the adjacent land proposed for development. Currently, the vehicular movement on and around this setting arises from the residents of the cul-de-sac and visiting dog walkers and ramblers gaining access to the park and to the proposed development site. This is an extremely quiet residential area, enhanced by the adjacent parkland and the natural beauty of Rye Bank fields.

My opposition to these development proposals are as follows:

1. Creating vehicular access to this site (set out in Options 1,2 & 3) would drastically alter the nature of Rye Bank Road, Stretford. Vehicle movements in this road would increase dramatically as it would become a cut through route for traffic onto Longford Road, Chorlton, Rye Bank Road, Chorlton and onto Edge Lane, Chorlton. Even if this vehicle access is deemed for 'emergency vehicles' only, in reality members of the public would still use this route.

2. Trafford Council have not been made aware of these proposals by Manchester City Council or been consulted. These proposals have far reaching consequences for Trafford Council and for their residents.

3. Rye Bank fields were gifted to MMU for student recreational use. Whilst the University has negated to use this facility for its students, it is, and always has been, in continuous use by the residents of Firswood and Chorlton for recreation and leisure – thus affording the local (council tax paying) population the opportunity to have access to a natural environment in an urban area. This facility benefits the health and well-being of our local community. As MMU state in their outline proposal that the site hasn't been used for many years by the University and has become 'vacant and unmanaged grassland' then now is the time to hand back their gift to the people of Manchester to whom it originally belonged -a magnificent gesture that would be applauded by the local community.

4. Rye Bank Fields adjoins Longford Park to the east and shares a natural tree line boundary. As Longford Park has a conservation area management plan and this development would impact this conservation area and the wildlife within then surely Trafford Council, with responsibility for Longford Park, should have been consulted on these proposals by Manchester City Council.

5. Any development on this site will have far reaching consequences for the habitats and wildlife that are situated within this site and in the adjacent areas.

6. No mention is made on the proposed options of the Thirlmere Aqueduct that is located at the end of Rye Bank Road, Stretford and how any development would take this structure into account.

In conclusion, the proposed development options will not transform this area into as the proposal states 'a great place to live' but will blight the lives of the current residents of Firswood and Chorlton through creating new road networks, increasing vehicle traffic flow, by removing an area of natural beauty and preventing the local community,

who maintain the custom set by decades of previous residents, to the access and enjoyment of this area of urban grassland habitat.

Objections to Development

1. Ownership. Ryebank Fields were given by Manchester council to MMU (formerly Manchester Polytechnic. It would be a civic gesture for MMU to return ownership of this land to Manchester Council to be left as it stands for the benefit of local citizens.

2. Removal of Local Public Green Space. It is not 'disused land' in the eyes of the local residents, but a useful and attractive leisure space, which brings a true rural experience in an urban setting. Being 'unmanaged' this gives it unique value. It is largely litter free thanks to the efforts of local residents, and has clear pathways through.

In terms of security it is well frequented by responsible local residents; who are the local 'eyes and ears' of the site. It is remarkable for an urban space of this type quite how 'unspoilt' the land is.

3. Rejection of 'Increased Bio-diversity' Statement. The development framework summary notes 'increased biodiversity'. This statement is objectionable on the basis that it is a nebulous term. The land is currently 'bio-diverse' and developing as a young woodland area which has been noted as a rural space. It is argued that any 'left in-situ' strips of land will not be maintained and cleared of litter given that the local residents have a devalued local space which will have lost its unique character. The MMU 'Bioblitz' ecology survey of the fields believes the land has ecological value. (see <http://bit.ly/2yMbDSd>)

4. Impracticality and Risks Caused by Development. Expensive and Intrusive Groundworks. As an uncontrolled landfill site any development will risk un-earthing capped contamination during any excavation works (inevitable to replace topsoil and provide compacted graded subsurface road and hard standing). House foundations will most likely need to be either concrete floating rafts or piled. Piling is at risk of underground obstructions, which may need excavating out in local areas.

5. Site Traffic Impact. As noted in objection 4. extensive excavation and removal, and breaking up of landfill material would be reasonable to expect. Assuming say 20,000m² say of area excavated (see objection 6) to 2m deep to remove offsite would generate 40,000m³ (80,000 tonnes) of excavated material some 5,000+ lorry trips removing material and delivering new topsoil/hardcore/building material and so on, as a rough estimate (around 14 trips a day for a normal working 18month period of 15-20 ton trucks). This might reasonably assumed to be via the south end (Longford Road) part of the site, to avoid tracking over the existing water main running across the north entrance.

6. Storm Water Retention Under-Estimated
It has been approximately calculated from

the scheme shown opposite that the total hard standing and roof area added to the site will be in the order of 2,600m² for access roads and 17,500m² for the houses (250m² per house). Total circa 20,100m². In a 80mm storm this might require 1600m³ water storage (30mx30mx1.8m deep pond).

The ditch shown in the current scheme would contain circa 16% this amount of water, achieving only partial surface water retention; a sop to contemporary planning aspirations.

Any scheme is at risk of water-borne Japanese Knotweed spread into the residential area.

7. Increased Local Traffic & Change of Nature of Roads. The north end of the site is currently a cul de sac. The south end is a quiet corner and Longford park entrance. The optional schemes indicate 3 with through roads which would alter significantly the nature of the site. 70 houses would generate another 140 cars/vehicles at least on the development site and locally; affecting local ecology and increasing local traffic congestion. Access at both ends would create a new traffic 'rat run'. Trafford Council are concerned at the lack of consultation in this respect.

Chorlton is a community made up of a diverse range of people from different backgrounds across the socioeconomic spectrum. As stated in the Chorlton District Centre Area Action Plan 2010-2020, 'the district centre offer must have the capacity to accommodate an increased demand on services from a growing and disparate population, while the diversity of its retail, employment and service offer must cater for residents of all ages and circumstance.' Residents feel strongly that the development of Ryebank Fields should reflect the diversity of the community in the same way that is expected of the District Centre.

The area has a blend of large semidetached houses and smaller terraces, which creates a balanced community containing people of all ages. To reference the Chorlton Area Action Plan again, the Plan noted that the housing offer in Chorlton is varied, representing a higher quality offer than the majority of competing centres across Manchester. It is characterised by an above-average stock of quality detached Victorian family dwellings and offers the opportunity to retain key workers, young professionals and families within Chorlton. The Plan also shows that the average price of detached units sold in Chorlton in 2009 was around £275,000, in comparison to £460,000 in Didsbury and £400,000 in Bramhall. However, average prices for flats, terraced and semi-detached housing has retained a greater degree of parity with the competing centres.

This trend continues today, with detached properties in Chorlton being valued on average at £100,000 - £150,000 less than those in Didsbury and Bramhall, whereas terraced houses in Chorlton (£295,000) are now more expensive than in Bramhall (£234,000) and comparable with those in Didsbury (£333,000). This suggests that the demand for houses in Chorlton is not for executive homes as proposed for Ryebank Fields, but more for modest family units of 2 and 3 bedrooms as there is a growing scarcity of supply for young people from the area wanting to buy a first property or for older people looking to downsize.

It is our view that the development should be tailored to Chorlton and that a development of executive housing that may have worked well in Didsbury should not simply be copied and pasted onto the Ryebank Fields site. A much wider range of house types and sizes is required for this site to adequately reflect the needs of the community.

The proposals currently focus exclusively on 'executive' homes for private sale. As well as owner occupied properties, we believe that the development should include affordable starter homes and rented accommodation, including an element of social housing, all of which are urgently needed in the area. We agree with the Greater Manchester Strategy's ambition to provide safe, decent and affordable housing for all and feel that a more diverse mix of housing on this site will help to achieve that.

The proposals should include a mix of reasonably priced 2 and 3 bed units rather than exclusively larger executive units. The change in the proposed mix of units could see increased density in some parts of the site, compensating for the reduced council tax receipts from 'executive' homes by increasing the overall number of properties.

The Greater Manchester Strategy includes an aspiration to make Manchester more 'age-friendly'. With this in mind, the proposals should include homes that are suitable for older people's needs.

There are many local residents who want to downsize, which would release family or 'executive' housing for others to buy elsewhere in the area. This could be facilitated by including smaller homes with 2 bedrooms and some single-storey homes with communal gardens, which would suit local retired people. The inclusion of property suitable for older residents would reduce the need for extra school places. Furthermore, retired people would not generally go out in cars at peak/school run times again alleviating traffic problems.

The development should also cater for some specially adapted properties for disabled people and homes should, wherever possible be designed to Lifetime Homes standards to ensure that they are convertible for disabled residents in the future. This would enable the development to cater for a range of households, including families but also older local residents who want to downsize, but want to stay in the area and do not want to live in an apartment.

Chorlton Co-housing Company is a group of 8 older home owners who see the benefit of selling their 3 and 4 bedroomed houses for family use and having smaller more energy efficient and accessible smaller homes within a shared community. In particular, a block of six self-contained flats with a shared garden and shared communal space offering opportunities for mutual support. The adoption of co-housing as a wider principle for part of the site would also meet an urgent social need in the area and release large family homes elsewhere in the area to the market.

There are several medical centres in the local area and two primary schools in close proximity to the site, but they are already at their limit. The council should ensure additional capacity is created to accommodate the proposed increase in population due to the Ryebank and Precinct redevelopments. We would encourage MCC to include health and education contributions in the s106 agreement.

Home Office figures from October 2017 confirm that crime rates in Manchester have risen by 31% in the last year . Chorlton has one of the highest burglary rates in the country and 10 burglaries were reported in the local area around Ryebank Fields in September 2017 alone .

In order to discourage crime in the area, we would expect that the development is designed to achieve Secured by Design accreditation and that early interaction with the Police Architectural Liaison Officer is carried out. We would also expect MCC to require a financial contribution to deliver a proportionate increase in local police presence to account for the new residential areas.

Chorlton Library is a well-used local facility, housed in a local landmark building, which has survived in the face of numerous library closures elsewhere in Greater Manchester. A financial contribution to support the continued operation of the library should be agreed as part of the s106 agreement.

There is a longstanding concern over the surface water and foul drainage network on Longford Road. United Utilities are frequently required to send vehicles to pump or clear the drains due to blockages and overflows. This is clearly unsanitary and a public nuisance.

It is anticipated that the development will need to discharge to the sewerage network on Longford Road, which would exacerbate the existing problems without proper management and repairs to the existing system as required. It should be required that this matter be carefully considered by the applicants and that discussions with United Utilities are held at an early stage so that adequate repairs or improvements are made in a timely fashion to ensure that the development does not worsen the existing situation and preferably acts as a stimulus to decisively address the existing problems.

The Residents' Group expects that the council will ensure that a s106 agreement is reached with the applicant to mitigate any impact on community and physical infrastructure. Although the site has a limited area of made ground, possibly containing some historic contamination associated with the brickworks, this site is deliverable and viable for

The overarching traffic problem in the local area is created by school related trips and the athletics stadium. This is particularly acute on Longford Road and at the junction with Oswald Road, as there are two schools within 100m of each other in this location. As St John's is an RC School its catchment area is also significantly wider than other primaries and a high proportion of parents bring children to school by car. In addition, traffic associated with the Longford Park Athletics Stadium causes significant congestion. The roads are narrow and do not accommodate space for cars to pass, regularly causing blockages, exacerbated by delivery vehicles. Although it is appreciated that the proposed development is only obliged to mitigate any impact of traffic associated with its own impacts, the Residents' Group would encourage MCC and MMU to fully investigate options for easing congestion in the area at peak times, and whether the Ryebank Fields site can be part of that solution.

We would strongly encourage the developer to conduct traffic surveys around the site to fully understand the existing traffic movements, particularly around peak time, in order to design a road layout that could improve local traffic for everyone. Traffic survey locations should include Longford, Newport, Nicolas, Oswald, Rye Bank, Kensington and Great Stone Roads as a minimum.

This traffic survey information should be used to inform the access and movement strategy for the site and to determine whether the two ends of Rye Bank Road should be reconnected through the site. It is possible that reopening this route could alleviate school-related congestion at the Oswald Road/Longford Road crossroads, which is a pinch point at peak times, as vehicles arriving from Kensington Road could take an alternative route to St. John's RCP through the development site. We would ask that this scenario be included in the traffic modelling carried out by the developer alongside the option of designating Longford and Newport Roads as one way streets, possibly at peak times only.

All dwellings should be provided with adequate cycle storage facilities to encourage take up of cycling and new roadways through the site should be safe for cyclists use.

We would also expect all private garages to be fitted with electric vehicle charging points and for several public charging points to be provided on-street. Cabling should be provided throughout the development to allow additional charging points to be installed in the future as take up of electric vehicles increases.

Chorlton is dominated by red brick homes with slate pitched roofs. The site's parkland setting and enclosed nature present an opportunity to create a statement of architectural design. The development should be imaginative, innovative, distinctive and creative, in keeping with and enhancing the artistic and distinctive character of Chorlton. We would also encourage the houses to meet the London space standards as a minimum, to allow comfortable living spaces for all and for houses to meet the Lifetime Homes standards, to ensure that they are future proofed and convertible for those with limited mobility issue or disabilities.

Sustainable Construction

It states in the Chorlton Area Action Plan: 'Historically, town and district centres have not responded to the threat of climate change. However, opportunities now exist for the district centres to step up and lead the Manchester response. In particular, Chorlton has the opportunity to lead at the cutting edge of this change and the implementation of sustainable measures can have a positive economic and environmental impact on the attractiveness of the district centre.'

The Residents strongly support this view of Chorlton and would encourage the landowner and developer to make the response to climate change a central feature of the development's character. The appetite for environmentally conscious living is strong in this area and sustainable housing would be seen as a key selling point for future residents.

It is understood that MMU has recently been awarded the status of greenest university in the country. This is an outstanding achievement and one that clearly demonstrates the University's commitment to sustainable behaviour and development. This commitment to high environmental standards is shared by the Residents. As already mentioned, Chorlton is well known for its environment-conscious population and a development that reflected that community mindset would be very popular with the type of people who already live in Chorlton and those looking to move here.

We therefore strongly encourage MMU to focus on engaging with a development partner or partners who share this commitment to genuinely sustainable development.

Our view is that the development should aim to achieve exemplary standards of sustainable design, which would be as near carbon neutral as possible. Opportunities for on-site low and zero carbon energy production should be investigated, along with water reducing or recycling technologies. Buildings should also be highly insulated and oriented to maximise solar gain to minimise the need for heating. This would also help towards the council's stated aims of achieving a 100% clean energy city by 2050. Another stated aim in the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 is to be at the forefront on environmental initiatives and mitigating climate change; this site provides an opportunity to deliver part of that promise.

We also believe that the development should be built with modern methods of construction if a suitable development partner can be found. Off-site modular construction is now a viable option and can deliver highly thermally efficient homes, with little site generated waste, minimal noisy construction work and significantly reduced construction traffic. A housing development of 70 dwellings would require an approximately 18 month construction period with traditional construction methods but only around 3 months with modular construction. This would be a major positive for people living near to the construction site.

The Mayor has recently confirmed a commitment to improving and protecting the environment of Greater Manchester and this has been encapsulated in the Greater Manchester Strategy. We strongly support this aspiration and believe that sustainable development plays a key role in this. In relation to Ryebank Fields, we would note the following environmental improvement opportunities.

Ground Conditions and Contamination

The site includes part of an historic brickworks and anecdotal evidence indicates that some part of the old building, possibly including some buried asbestos tiles, are buried onsite. It is therefore necessary to conduct a full site investigation in order to develop a remediation strategy for the site that minimises the risks to existing and future residents.

Construction Traffic and Noise

Noise associated with development can be a longstanding nuisance for adjacent residents. As stated previously, we would support the use of modern methods of construction such as modular due to the significant reduction in the time spent on-site and the associated reduction in construction noise and traffic.

Flood Risk and Ecology

The site has areas that are prone to flooding and opportunities to manage surface water sustainably and for the benefit of ecology should be carefully considered. Although no formal designation for the protection of wildlife exists on the site, the site is now well used by birds, invertebrates and, quite possibly, bats. A comprehensive suite of ecological surveys must be undertaken to inform a suitable mitigation and enhancement strategy to deliver a net gain for biodiversity across the site.

Trees

The large high quality trees along the boundary with Longford Park and along Longford Rd should be retained within the proposals as they are of good amenity and ecological value and create a strong setting for the development. Additional planting of native tree species, including some berry-producing species, should be incorporated throughout the new layout to create a more naturalistic setting and encourage birdlife. Broadleaved trees also help to reduce particulate concentrations in the air as they stick to leaf surfaces and all planting helps to absorb CO₂ and improve local air quality as well as creating a pleasant environment.

Landscape and Open Space

Although left largely untended at the moment, Ryebank Fields have developed into a natural-looking landscape with trees, long grasses and blackberry brambles, which encourage users to walk in and interact with the environment. The landscaping strategy for the site should take cues from this existing landscape and avoid harsh manicured or hard landscaped finishes and instead aim for a softer and greener setting for the new homes. This will create a more pleasant place for the now occupants and people passing through and will relate well to the adjacent parkland setting.

Air Quality

As stated previously, we would expect that this development is fully equipped with electric vehicle charging points throughout and that adequate bicycle storage is provided to all homes with a view to minimising air quality impacts from private car use. An extensive planting scheme will also assist with improving local air quality.

The mix of homes should include two bedroom homes, bungalows and properties suitable as retirement homes.

Two access points for vehicles to the north and south are essential. Longford Road can't cope with the traffic for up to 70 homes.

As a resident at the Ryebank Road end of Newport Road, I am most concerned about the increased risk of flooding from any development on Ryebank fields. I have water under my house already. It is essential that an independent flood risk investigation be carried out and the results made public and conveyed to local residents before any plans are decided. My preference is to keep the fields as green space.

Very concerned about the amount of traffic that is likely to be created. Properties of this type are likely to be owned by families with multiple motor vehicles. I am not content with suggestions that people cyclists and vehicles should share space. In my opinion this will discourage the walking and cycling. Vehicles should be banned from areas of the site - perhaps restricted to the periphery. Look at best practice in German developments. Do all to possible to discourage car use and car ownership.

Also build properties to the highest environmental standards. This will add a small % to overall cost but unlikely to deter type of people this development seems to be aimed at.

I've read that MMU aims to leave a positive legacy for the area with this site development. As a local resident I feel that here is an opportunity for the chosen developer to support Manchester's strategy for the promotion of low-carbon lifestyles and produce an innovative development of which the area could be proud. While high design values are important for any new building plans, I would argue that the current proposals for an estate of executive houses does not address the housing requirements of the area; I would welcome a proposal that included a mixture of tenures, combining smaller, affordable homes (eg 2 bedroom) with larger family homes, and flats for older people, all built to the highest environmental standards. This would enable a more varied community than the proposal as it stands. A mixed community could also address concerns voiced by local residents, particularly about increased traffic (on already congested roads) and drainage, as well as pressure on existing infrastructure, notably local schools.

I thought initially the plans were to transform the neglected site into a public/community park, perhaps with public facilities, or developing the nearby sports/leisure sites in Longford Park. This would have been great. I then realised it was just another development, which I oppose, hence not answering most of the questions which assume its going to be turned into a housing estate. There's enough sites elsewhere to build on. Please turn this into a public park.

We moved to Rye Bank Road specifically to be next to the park and the fact it is a cul de sac was the other major consideration. I was frankly horrified to learn that plans were afoot to build on the wasteland, and in particular that providing vehicle access to the area via Rye Bank Road was a possibility. Of the four options, only number 4 is at all acceptable. The others are definitely NOT acceptable, due to the access available via Rye Bank Road. This would be totally unfair to people living on Rye Bank Road as we are not in Chorlton, and yet would suffer adverse effects of through traffic. There is no doubt that people living in the new proposed housing AND existing Longford Road housing would use that route as a convenient way to the Chorlton shops. My other worry is the potential loss of a valuable piece of wasteland from the point of view of the wildlife who uses it. They have no voice, and need our protection. I suggest that if this building does go ahead, that a tract of the wasteland nearest Rye Bank Road be retained, as a wildlife corridor. This piece of land has a substantial number of trees, vital to birds and insects, so would be valuable to keep. Also, doing this would give some insurance against any future decisions to open up the route to Rye Bank Road to vehicles. Allowing access to cycles and walkers sounds reasonable on the face of it, but that could easily be extended to vehicles at a later date, simply by widening the path to a track. Sorry if this sounds cynical, but a through route would ruin the peace and space that we currently enjoy. One other point :- if building is to happen, please please can we not have three storey buildings. They would be even more visible to us, and dominant. Not in keeping with the existing two storey housing. I do hope that my suggestion of leaving a band of the wasteland as a division between us and Chorlton will be considered. It seems an eminently sensible idea to me. I think the people on Rye Bank Road would be much more positive about this proposed development if that was done. Thank you

- 1.No option offers the benefit of the land as an extension to the parkland area of Longford Park and leaving the land for leisure activity. Housing demand is driving the usage when schools, roads, medical facilities, drainage, public services etc are all stretched, not least by the devastating cuts to local authority funding by the very government that calls for more housing.
- 2.The previous application to develop this land for housing was refused permission largely because Longford Road could not take the traffic as well as cope with the traffic generated by St John's School evening and mornings. The reason given as to why Ryebank Road does not run through in the options on offer is that that would create a "rat run" but permeability through many alternative routes alleviates congestion on the main routes.
3. Why over the years has Ryebank Road never been joined up even years ago when traffic was much lighter ? Is it two local authorities who can't agree ? Or is it the fact that the sub- surface conditions on this land are so bad as to make such a link uneconomic ? The fact of the Jackson's Brickwork clay pits and that the area is known as the "Islands" on old maps may give a clue.
4. The attempts to designate this area as "Village Green" in the past show a popular desire for informal leisure activity there. Students in the 80's experienced playing football there when the Polytechnic had a pavilion was it the case that drainage and subsidence made the ground maintenance uneconomic ?
5. My view is that there are not sufficient areas for wild life, wild flower meadow and informal very local exercise, this is an ideal area to develop as such with better pedestrian access than exists at present.

THERE SHOULD BE CONSIDERATION FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING E.G. SHARED OWNERSHIP HOMES, AS OPOSED TO OUT OF REACH EXPENSIVE HOUSING

This submission is made on behalf of the Friends Of Longford Park (FOLP)

We would have preferred the land being used for recreational or educational purposes. In our view the population of Old Trafford, Firswood, Stretford, Whalley Range and Chorlton isn't particularly well provided for with open space. In the last three decades school sites have been sold off for housing development and there has also been a loss of sports club land again for house building. Vacant green land is a very scarce resource in south Manchester. The former Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU) site in Didsbury has been converted to housing. Community well being isn't going to be enhanced if Manchester City Council (MCC) has limited vision with land use. More housing may be needed, but so is public open space and school sites. The primary and secondary school sites in Chorlton are already cramped even as the school population continues to rise. Short term financial gain for MCC and MMU is being gained at the expense of the community's longer term well being.

Looking at the MCC committee report - Chorlton New Residential Growth Opportunities (26.7.17) it is clear that both MCC and MMU are determined to build housing on the former playing fields. Therefore assuming that eventually a planning application is submitted and then approved FOLP's concerns are :

1. Boundary line as it runs alongside Longford Park and existing housing on the Trafford side of Ryebank Rd. There needs to be agreement between Trafford Council (TC) and MMU/developer as to the exact line of the boundary.
2. Trees and vegetation on the boundary line. No work to take place before discussion and agreement between TC and the developer. It should also be noted that the line of tall trees - Lombardy planes? - were planted between 1881 and 1889 to mark the boundary of the historic estate of John Rylands.
3. Visual impact upon Longford Park. Any buildings to be well set back from the boundary line, likewise roads and street furniture. Extensive landscaping should be incorporated into the scheme and be appropriate to a site adjacent to a park.
4. Drainage. The field grass on the Trafford side of the boundary is subject to flooding after heavy rain. The redevelopment of the site must not increase water run off into the park or increase water flow into Longford Brook.
5. Footpath access to the park. We would like to see improvements in pedestrian access from Ryebank - Longford Rds junction and from Ryebank Rd. (Trafford side). The former is located on Trafford land however the site boundary abuts the entrance. With the latter a proper entry point is needed plus a path across the park grass. We do not believe there is any justification for new footpaths across the park field designed primarily to give direct access to the park for residents of the new housing.
If the main access road to the scheme is to be near to the Ryebank - Longford Rds entrance how is this going to impact on road safety at this point?
6. The 'value' of Longford Park. FOLP believes the park adds value to the site as a housing development, especially as the MCC report talks about it, ie. the site itself, presenting an opportunity to meet the City's need for high quality executive homes (para 6.3). The report also makes positive references about the park both for the proposed housing and the wider community. The latter we take to mean people living in Manchester not Trafford and we know the park is well used by people living in Chorlton. The report refers to reinvesting the value from the strategic disposal to deliver new and improved education, community, sporting and recreational facilities (para 6.3). FOLP requests that some of this value ie the developers financial levy be used to improve/add to park facilities. Such investment would be of benefit to the future residents of the new housing and the wider community.

Finally, can you please ensure that when eventually a planning application is made that FOLP are notified. The notification being sent to

This response is from Trafford Council M32 0TH

Access to the site

The Development Framework presents four potential layout options for the site, with most of the options appearing to propose access from Longford Road, as well as Ryebank Road in Trafford borough. Unfortunately the Development Framework document (and the supporting consultation literature) is not clear in relation to the type of access being proposed at Ryebank Road in Trafford. In particular it is unclear whether or not it will be used for free vehicle access or whether it would be limited to pedestrian/cycle access and possibly emergency vehicles. Trafford Council considers that a pedestrian/cycle access only, providing enhanced connectivity to the surrounding area would minimise the impact on Trafford's residents and would help to deliver an integrated and sustainable development.

Notwithstanding the above, as further details emerge in relation to the scheme it will be important for the City Council to consult with Trafford Council as local highway authority to ensure that the scheme is deliverable in highways terms.

Longford Park

The site is adjacent to Longford Park and therefore any future development of the site will have an impact on this historic Park and will need to be assessed and where necessary mitigated. As part of this assessment, the City Council should be aware that the Longford Park Conservation Area Appraisal and associated Management Plan were adopted by Trafford Council on 31st October 2016.

Whilst the Development Framework makes reference to the existence of Longford Park and the ability of the potential residents to make use of this asset, it is important that the City Council notes that this Park is wholly within, and managed by, Trafford Council and is a key asset for local residents.

The illustrative drawings in relation to options 2 and 4 appear to suggest that there will be no physical boundary between the development and the Park and that the parkland will be extended to within the development, with footpaths providing direct access to the Park from the development. Trafford Council is concerned that there are no proposals included for the future maintenance of this new area of parkland given that Longford Park is wholly within Trafford.

It is clear from the Development Framework that the development proposals for Ryebank Road are likely to increase the use of Longford Park and therefore appropriate mitigation, at Longford Park, for the increased use of this open space should be considered as part of any development proposal on the Ryebank Road site.

Whilst I appreciate that at this point in time there is no planning application before the City Council and that you are consulting on a framework and options for the site,

Trafford Council expects to be fully engaged in detailed discussions should a scheme progress. In particular Trafford Council should be engaged on matters of highways, developer contributions, heritage, landscape, open space and the boundary interface between Longford Park and the proposed development site. I would also advise that you engage at an early stage in the process with the Friends of Longford Park community group should the scheme progress.

We oppose the Ryebank Road proposed development. It is our view that no houses should be built on this site. This area should remain open fields for the use of local people. If this development goes ahead, it will remove one of the last accessible open spaces in Chorlton. We are of the view that this development should be resisted, as it was the last time development proposals were suggested on this site; the situation has not changed. Green, open spaces should be treasured and preserved in Chorlton, not built upon.

Should the Council approve plans to build on Ryebank Fields, we feel that it is deeply inappropriate to support building expensive, executive homes on this site, particularly because there is a critical shortage of affordable, rental homes in Chorlton.

Water meters use of rain water and any other measures to prevent further dangers of flooding in long ford area.

Soler panels on east west south facing roofs

It is good to see a housing development that takes in to consideration larger families. Although I do not become to expensive homes for the super rich with no kids. Please make a road that will run straight thought the site that joins the 2 roads Ryebank to Ryebank! Having a one way in and one way out of the estate creates a ghettoised community cut off from the rest of chorlton. Either way exclusive or will create no go areas depending on who buys property. owner or to rent.

You should consider using the space for UA92 student accomodtion much nicer for studants to cycle or walk.

1 density

Their proposal for 72 dwellings on 4.6ha is too low given the pressure on housing supply.

The existing neighbourhoods have 32 dwelling per hectare (dph) at the Trafford end and 50 dph at the Manchester end. The consultation proposal are for 16 dph - that's the same as suburban LA, even Howard's Garden City aimed at 45dph, Islington and Notting Hill have had over 150dph for a long time.

This is not cramming, this is places with enough people living nearby and animating the streets to make the place feel safe, friendly and desirable. More people also strengthens the viability of public transport as well as local services within a walking distance.

2 access & making the best use of the site for all

If highway access issues are preventing this currently then it would seem better to build appropriately on part of the site and leave the rest as open space either in perpetuity to give better access into the rest of the area or as a meanwhile use until negotiations can allow access to the north and hence the opportunity to finish the neighbourhood - tying the neighbourhoods together

3 a better kind of value

The thoughts illustrated here (sketches submitted to South Neighbourhoods Team) show 270 houses, even more homes could be created if flats were added to the mix. 72 Band A homes is only going to bring in a fraction of the income to the council of what is here, even if only half of it were built

4 improve the security of the neighbourhood and Longford Park

The development here can also make the park safer to use. An exclusive inward looking development of homes for the wealthy is both going to attract crime and ignore the opportunity to reduce it in the park with more windows facing onto it by the reality and perception of greater supervision. 3 storey 'villa' blocks along the park would increase the distance of this supervision as well as allow further views from the houses on the other side of the street.

"natural drainage" is a joke as the site is prone to flooding!

would want to see low-impact modern construction techniques used

need to have a mix of housing types, not just "executive" houses. consider social housing, cohousing.

my original understanding was that ryebank rd was going to be completely opened up. this appears to no longer be the case?! that will simply not work. (a) local traffic is bad enough as it is, (b) how on earth will this play well with the proposed pedestrianisation of wilbraham rd and subsequent rerouting along nicholas rd (c) notwithstanding the latter opening up ryebank rd will be generally beneficial.

"no cul-de-sacs", without opening up ryebank rd you are creating what is effectively two cul-de-sacs!!!!

The Ryebank Road site, in its present state, provides much needed green space in a densely populated area; there is a great social and ecological value in leaving it as it is. ANY development will put considerable additional pressure on already overstretched and underfunded services e.g. medical services, school places. More housing, particularly of the 'executive' type proposed, will produce more traffic on extremely congested roads. The children of Oswald Road Primary School are already exposed to unacceptable levels of air pollution; the proposed developed will only worsen the situation. There is certainly a great need for more housing in the area but any development on this site should be for social and GENUINELY affordable housing, not overpriced properties designed to enrich developers and MMU.

This questionnaire is so biased as to be useless - all responses are predicated on accepting the idea that the site should be redeveloped, which it should not. Any additional housing on this site will destroy a valuable green asset, it will impose additional strain on the existing health, education and transport facilities with no additional support for these even mentioned, let alone provided for. This land was given free of charge by the City Council to Manchester Polytechnic for use as playing fields. MMU is now attempting to generate a maximum sum by this proposal, to which it has no moral right. The rejection of an application for this site by the planning inspector, who did not reject the idea, but found the density of that application to be overdevelopment which would pose unacceptable traffic congestion, is now being used to justify the current proposal because this now proposes a reduced number of dwellings. However, that logic fails to take into account the changed demography of Chorlton, which now has a much higher proportion of well to do families, almost all with cars, many with two or three. There have also been a significant number of new housing sites developed in the area since that last application. The pricing of parking at the precinct means that there is a great deal of non resident parking on the three streets which would be affected by the Ryebank development. The congestion already suffered on these streets means that it is rarely possible, at any time of day, to progress without having to back up, pull in, or otherwise avoid oncoming traffic. At school opening and closing it is even worse. Furthermore, it is by no means unknown for me not to be able to leave my drive because of cars completely blocking my exit, that space being available only because I park off road. There are plenty of "executive" houses in Chorlton. If any type of housing is needed, it is affordable housing, for either rent or purchase, but with adequate investment in the supporting infrastructure

We need more green space. Build on brownfield.

The proposed number of homes on the site is too great. There are issues with traffic and access.

Longford road bears a great deal of traffic due to the two schools in the area, and this housing plan will not improve matters. Rye Bank Road should be fully reopened to allow access from north and south. This at least would improve congestion.

Any building project should include affordable or starter homes. Chorlton has enough "exclusive" housing as it is. The area is becoming increasingly unaffordable.

Effort should be made to retain the trees bordering the site on all sides, for wildlife and for privacy of existing homes.

I am disappointed that the survey is not well designed. It does not give scope for residents to say they do not agree with any of the listed options in some sections. I think it would also be better to have comments boxes at the bottom of each section, rather than putting all extra comments at the back. However it is good that you have given space for as many extra comments as we wish to make.

I feel that Ryebank Fields represent a unique opportunity for a new type of socially and environmentally responsible development which reinforces the diversity and dynamism of the neighbourhood and preserves green space. I feel that the current proposals do not reflect the needs or character of the existing community and will have an unacceptable impact on local services and traffic as well as the immediate environment. I would like to see a development which has as its basic principles:

- a collaborative and consensual approach to the development of proposals with the voice of the local community at the heart of the process;
- is distinctive and imaginative, embracing innovation in its design and planning whilst responding to the character of the local community and respecting the views of those residents on the perimeter of the site;
- reflects the needs of the local community, providing housing affordable to local people and offering choice in tenure, building size and lifestyle, reflecting Chorlton's historic pattern of mixed scale and use;
- preserves green space and minimises the ecological, environmental and visual impact of the site and recognises its carbon footprint responsibilities;
- make a positive contribution to the surrounding area in terms of traffic management, drainage, roads and amenities.

Some of my detailed ideas are below.

The Development Framework has a good overall layout, with plenty of greenery and integration into Longford Park.

Assuming the traffic issues can be resolved satisfactorily:

Instead of standard housing design this development could be imaginative, innovative, distinctive, creative, in keeping with and enhancing the fairly unique character of Chorlton. It could be environmentally friendly with design excellence in line with the NPPF

I propose a development of eco houses which are as near carbon neutral as possible. These could be Scandinavian style, mainly timber, possibly modular construction. They would be well insulated, have sustainable energy sources, and possibly water recycling features.

This is in accord with The Manchester Strategy 'Our Manchester' and the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 This would also help towards the council's stated aims of carbon reduction of 44 % by 2020 (Manchester Core Strategy) and 100% clean energy city by 2050. Another stated aim in the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 is to be at the forefront on environmental initiatives and mitigating climate change.

This development could also act as a beacon for other new developments.

People taking up the opportunity to live in an eco house will have less cars per household than most families in non eco homes, and many will choose not to have cars at all, thus reducing the increase in traffic.

It should be a mix of reasonably priced 2 bed, including some one storey, 3 and 4 bed homes. This would enable the development to cater for a mix of households, including families but also older local residents who want to downsize, but want to stay in the area and do not want to live in an apartment. This is in line with the Manchester Core Strategy on low carbon lifestyles. It would also reduce the need for extra school places.

The 2 bed homes could be designed to take up no more space than a large detached house, and not contribute to housing density, whilst maintaining a high level of Council Tax Income, and would most likely have at most one car per dwelling, whereas large detached family houses would probably have several cars. Older people, especially those retired, would not generally be going out in cars at peak/school run times again alleviating traffic problems.

2 bed homes for local residents downsizing, would release family size housing, including 3 to 5 bed houses and possibly even bigger ones, for others to buy. At the moment there is no real opportunity for this. Most of the apartments suitable for older residents in Chorlton are also well away from public transport.

It should also cater for some specially adapted properties for disabled people.

I would also encourage the houses to meet the London space standards as a minimum, to allow comfortable living spaces for all and for houses to meet the Lifetime Homes standards, to ensure that they are future proofed and convertible for those with limited mobility issue or disabilities.

These would help fulfil the objectives in the NPPF and Manchester Core Strategy which state the need for high quality small units.

The development should also be mixed tenure some owner occupier, including affordable homes, and some social housing for rent. This would be better for the area than having all expensive housing in one development and concentrate affordable and social rented housing in the other proposed developments. Now the rules have been relaxed on borrowing and funding for Housing Associations it is possible for them to build without relying on s106 money.

At the moment there is a good mix in the area of large semidetached houses and smaller terraces, which gives a more balanced community.

This again is in accord with The Manchester Strategy 'Our Manchester', Manchester Core Strategy and Residential Growth strategy and the NPFF. It is also in line with Manchester Residential Quality Guidance, Providing for Housing Choice Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance.

If the above ideas are incorporated in the development I think MMU would be leaving a positive legacy in the area. It would also be in keeping with their mission statements include commitments to sustainability, partnership working and community engagement. I note that MMU is a key partner in promoting Manchester as an age friendly city. I would urge MMU as landowner to put these admirable strategic principles into practice and fully engage with the residents of Chorlton to help to deliver a development, alongside a responsible developer, that all stakeholders can be proud of.

I would encourage the landowner and developer to make the response to climate change a central feature of the development's character. The appetite for environmentally conscious living is strong in this area and sustainable housing would be seen as a key selling point for future residents.

I understood that MMU has recently been awarded the status of greenest university in the country. This is an outstanding achievement and one that clearly demonstrates the University's commitment to sustainable behaviour and development. This commitment to high environmental standards is shared by local residents. Chorlton is well known for its environment-conscious population and a development that reflected that community mindset would be very popular with the people who already live in Chorlton and those looking to move here.

I therefore strongly encourage MMU to focus on engaging with a development partner or partners who share this commitment to genuinely sustainable development.

Management of the Consultation

The north side of the site is in Trafford Council who were not notified of the consultation before it launched and wrote to Trafford residents to inform them of this.

This is a quote from the letter Trafford Council sent to residents:

"Manchester City Council have not discussed any of this with senior officers at Trafford Council and we will be insisting they do so. Please make this point if you attend a consultation session."

This would be part of a media campaign should Manchester City Council not heed the objections of the Trafford residents on the north side of the development.

Additionally, we learned there is a conveyancing report which details why MMU feels it can now sell this land to a developer when previously planning permission was rejected. We find it frustrating that this report has not been made available as part of the consultation. Again, this would be part of a media campaign if this is not released to the public.

The Development

It appears that a development of houses on this land is a done deal. The consultation has been presented in this way, with options and elements to choose from as opposed to a clear set of questions about whether residents agree with this kind of development or whether they would prefer other types of development. Why weren't residents given a choice of executive houses or a green community space for example.

Amenities

Most schools and local doctors are close to capacity so the additional residents from 70 family homes is going to put great strain on local amenities such as these.

What are these state of the art technologies that are mentioned the residential growth document along with the range of amenities to support the residents. Are new doctors, schools or roads due to be built?

Wildlife

This is green land and is a habitat to wild life that doesn't have this type of habitat in urban areas anymore. There is very clear evidence that wildlife uses this current green space as it travels to the Meadows and Sale and Chorlton water parks. This would be lost with the development of this space so Stretford and Chorlton residents would enjoy less wildlife in these remaining green spaces.

Access

There are mixed messages about the proposed access. On the first page of the online submission it says MMU propose one entrance from Longford Road to the south. However, three of the options in the consultation show vehicle access also from the north on Rye Bank Road.

The north entrance is a very rare cul-de-sac providing a unique and safe place for children to play, and residents to feel safe from heavy traffic. Any access from the north side would change this road for it's residents completely.

Speaking with representatives at the consultation days, it is clear that a through road linking the north and south parts of Rye Bank Road is being considered. This would create a rat run between Firwood and Chorlton and traffic levels would greatly increase.

No matter what restrictions are put in place a through road would become a rat run. Drivers will look to take whatever other alternative they can to driving either down Kings Road or Manchester Road. This a residential area and especially on the north side where Rye Bank Road is a cul-de-sac where kids are used to playing on the street. A rat run would be a danger to the residents and the surrounding nature.

Any proposals for vehicle access from the north side in Rye Bank Road would be resisted with legal action. Cycle and pedestrian access would clearly be acceptable.

Parking

By providing access to the development at the north entrance this would create more cars parking on the north part of Rye Bank Road as both an overflow from the new development but also from those on the south of Rye Bank Road, Longford Road, etc who already complain about too little parking availability now.

Imbalance in Voice of Residents

It was evident at the consultation days that residents on the south and north sides of the development site have different views about the access points. We heard residents from the south arguing strongly that all vehicle access should come from the north.

Our concern is that the density of residents in the south side is greater than the north so they will have a greater weight of opposition to the south entrance than those opposing the north entrance.

Traffic

The north side of the development already has a lot of traffic as the cut through from Chorlton to Stretford as well as regular event traffic to Old Trafford Cricket Ground and Old Trafford Football Stadium.

The range of transport routes are already under extensive pressure. If the access comes from the North then the traffic will get much worse on Kings road at a junction which is already strained with the amount of traffic both towards Chester road and onto Talbot road. There has been more road access to get onto High Lane, but no consideration to funnel traffic north to Great Stone Road. This would cause considerable congestion for public and private transport.

In addition to the cars for these multiple car households there would also be increased traffic from bin lorries and home deliveries. The demographic of the people who will buy the proposed houses will have many home deliveries of groceries, and other e-commerce goods.

Low Carbon City

It states that in the residential growth document that the objective is to provide a low carbon city. How is this possible when introducing at least another 140 cars to the area and potentially polluting what was a quiet residential street in the Trafford borough?

RYE BANK PLAYING FIELDS PROPOSAL

It seems that we are being given choices of development proposals as if this is a taken that there will be development on this site. Please can I draw attention to the title of the area in that these were given over to Manchester Metropolitan University as 'playing fields'. Why has the purpose of this land now seem to have changed to land for development? In my opinion it would be for the good of the community and the wildlife that inhabits this land that the area be kept as a very rare piece of wild untamed nature reserve. This area of land is used a variety of wildlife - some rare, that use it as a habitat and also an important transit point to the water park.

As can be seen on some of the housing proposals, access can be seen from both the north at Rye Bank Road and the south at Longford Road. I strongly object in particular to the plan which links the north and the south. No matter what restrictions are put in place nothing will prevent this road from becoming a rat run. Drivers will look to take whatever other alternative they can to driving either down Kings Road or Manchester road. This would bring a great many problems to the area. This is a residential area and especially on the north side where Rye Bank Road is a cul-de-sac where children are used to playing on the street. A rat run would be a danger to the residents and the surrounding nature.

Any access from the north would cause great issues for the residents of Rye Bank Road and the surrounding roads. Already this area suffers from heavy event traffic and parking with the cricket ground and Old Trafford on the doorstep. Residents of Rye Bank Road have only recently been given event parking restrictions to manage this parking overcrowding. By having access from the north the problem would again worsen. More cars and parking needs would spill from the new proposed estate and also from the existing residents and visitors of Longford Road.

Access from the north would also put a lot of pressure on the roads - especially Kings Road at a junction with High Lane which is already under strain with the amount of traffic turning onto High Lane to reach Chester Road. It seems that new road access had been considered for the southern entrance with increased traffic flow down High Lane from Chester Road, however a northern access point would weigh immensely on Kings Road and Great Stone Road which already suffer from heavy usage especially at rush hour and school time with St Johns and St Hilda's off Rye Bank Road and Stretford High School on Great Stone Road. We can see that provisions have been made to the south, however no provisions have been made for increased traffic flow to the north This will need to be addressed should the proposal granting access from the north go ahead.

It seems that this proposal has been very much a consideration of Manchester City council. As a resident of Trafford Council I have seen no proposals for any traffic, school, doctors, dentists, public transport and other considerations should access in any way be offered from the north. I would expect a full public consultation with Trafford Council should this be the case.

Please note that the weight of public objections for the south entrance - ie Longford Road and the surrounding roads, will be much greater than from the north due to the density of population on the south. Also in the fact that this proposal hasn't been put directly yet to the residents of Trafford for consultation. as is has with the Manchester City Council residents. Having attended a couple of the open days not one member of Trafford Council was there to answer questions as this was very much a Manchester City Council proposal.

Should access be considered from the north, the residents of Trafford would expect a full enquiry as to the impact this will have on the Trafford amenities and infrastructure.

It is my strong view as a resident of Nicolas Road that the main access to the site should be from the north with emergency access only from Longford Road. Traffic congestion in these roads is already extreme and should not be added to, particularly in view of the two schools in the area. If this is expensive housing the chances are that car ownership will be high. The current site is an important place for wild life. Claiming this will be enhanced is absurd. It must be preserved as far as possible. There should be a mix of housing. The Council needs to consider the extra stress this proposed housing will place on schools and transport in the area. Both are already stretched.

The entrance to Longford Park near the junction of Ryebank and Longford roads is impractical to use when cycling, especially if with children. It should be improved at the earliest possible opportunity and access to it should be maintained throughout any construction works.

I have concerns about the "Potential Traffic Management Considerations" as converting any of these roads to one-way for motoring could increase the likelihood of speeding and rat-running. Commendably residents do not park motor vehicles on footways and this, combined with the potential to meet an oncoming motorist, results in a relatively calm highway environment that should not be placed at risk by any measures that could enable easier through-motoring.

Far too many houses planned. This will have a significant impact on traffic.

Primarily we are opposed to any development. However, should there eventually be a development we support the Ryebank Fields alternative proposals – basic principles set out below.

As Chorlton residents, we feel that Ryebank Fields represent a unique opportunity for a new type of socially and environmentally responsible development which reinforces the diversity and dynamism of the neighbourhood and preserves green space. We feel that the current proposals do not reflect the needs or character of the existing community and will have an unacceptable impact on local services and traffic as well as the immediate environment. We would like to see a development which:

- adopts a collaborative and consensual approach to the development of proposals with the voice of the local community at the heart of the process;
- is distinctive and imaginative, embracing innovation in its design and planning whilst responding to the character of the local community and respecting the views of those residents on the perimeter of the site;
- reflects the needs of the local community, providing housing affordable to local people and offering choice in tenure, building size and lifestyle, reflecting Chorlton's historic pattern of mixed scale and use;
- preserves green space and minimises the ecological, environmental and visual impact of the site and recognises its carbon footprint responsibilities;
- make a positive contribution to the surrounding area in terms of traffic management, drainage, roads and amenities.

I would like to express my support for the suggestions proposed by for a greater commitment to develop eco housing.

I would also like to express some concern regarding the traffic situation for this site given the proximity to two primary schools and the problems that are already experienced in the area at peak times. Any future development, must have adequate parking and the impact on congestion should be sought to be minimised. Traffic problems here could potentially be further exacerbated if the nearby Chorlton Precinct redevelopment does not provide sufficient parking space and access for any new residents on that site. Therefore, the two developments should be considered in unison with regards to traffic issues. As a result of these concerns, I strongly believe that there should be 2 accesses to the Ryebank Fields development, but as I do not live in the immediate area, I am unsure as to whether these accesses should be joined up as a through route or not.

I find it difficult to answer the survey as it assumes acceptance or rejection. I accept that this area will be developed but it is disappointing that the proposals as presented are so predictable and unimaginative. MMU, Dept of Architecture is a key partner in Manchester's Ambition for Ageing project, the City Council has written strategy for Housing for an Age Friendly Manchester. Why not use this as an opportunity put ideas into practice? I want to see mixed development including provision for older people. The scheme as set out doesn't address the problems of increased traffic, it doesn't reflect the local area.

Any new homes should compliment the surrounding victorian architecture and not reflect it. This is 2017, any new development should reflect the current world.
The density proposed seems quite low. If you can address the locals' traffic concerns adequately it may be possible to produce a higher density development which could offer more homes.
Has the possibility of providing a self build co-housing development been considered? Whilst it would be good to preserve the parkland feel of the site, a development which is grounded in the more ecological and community-based ideals of the chorlton area would be most reflective of the locality. It would make for a more unique and potentially more successful development in the long run.

Please propounded separated bike and walking routes with lighting where necessary for safety.

I strongly oppose this proposed development. We live close to Longford Park.

One of the reasons for moving to this area was the availability of green space which is especially important living in a city where green space is already limited but vital for humans, animals and plant life. This proposed development will significantly reduce green space. This particular piece of land is essential for biodiversity given it has been left more wild. We should be encouraging cities to have more wild areas like this for animals and plants. We are already doing so much damage to the planet ruining the habitat of animals.

We also moved to the area because it is quiet. This development will increase noise pollution which also has a negative impact on our wellbeing. We regularly use this green space. Green space is essential for both physical and mental health and there is plenty of evidence to support this. This development will especially impact on our mental wellbeing. Green space including more wild areas are important for child development too including physical, cognitive and social-emotional development. This proposed development will mean even less green space for our children. Children living in cities should be able to experience wildlife in areas like this land and engage in unstructured play. We currently like this area because Longford Road is not a busy Road and therefore it is safe for our children getting to and from the park. The proposed development with an entrance to Longford road would increase traffic and make this road significantly less safe for children, more noisy and polluted. We need to think first about children! Access from Ryebank north which leads onto an already busy main road would make more sense - no access to Longford Road!

I'm sure Manchester Metropolitan is only concerned about how much money they will get for this land and not thought about the consequences for local residents and the environment. The more we develop on spaces like this the more our cities will become polluted, concrete jungles and the bigger the impact this will have on our physical and emotional wellbeing. I do understand that more housing is needed but I struggle to also see how this will be affordable housing and I can think of plenty of other sites in Manchester which aren't green space where actual affordable housing can be built.

I would prefer that it's left as it is, considering it's ecological and recreational interest as an urban wooded meadow containing a variety of plants and animals under threat as well as roosting bats and foxes. I object to the increase in traffic and the inevitable airbourn release of the large amount corrugated asbestos roofing material from under the topsoil, especially because it's near a busy school. I personally witnessed this being covered with soil in the '70s and I'm sure this isn't taken into account by the school or the children's parents. There's no box to tick to say 'leave this as it is' but if there was I'm sure it would be the most popular choice.

There's no need for more housing in Chorlton. There are already many houses for sale, it's the prices that are the problem and building luxury houses in the area will make no difference to local people other than denying them these beautiful fields as recreation, for nature and you'll be increasing the traffic problems in the locality and burdens on the local amenities. "Much needed new homes" for who? Because we will not be able to afford them and they're not needed. If you want to build luxury houses go to Alderly Edge etc and see what they say.

Traffic and parking is already a problem on Longford road, especially at school time. The building of "high "quality" housing will turn Chorlton into a middle class ghetto. Why is there no social/affordable housing attached. It is unacceptable for companies to buy their way out of this obligation and shame on Manchester City council for allowing it.

Hi,
We are writing this representation on behalf of the Longford BMX project. We are seeking to construct a mini bmx track facility (aka Pump Track) for park users within Longford Park to the north of the current Longford Athletics track. At the time of writing we are currently establishing ourselves as a community organisation with a view to obtaining funding for the project moving forward.

We have been working in conjunction with local stakeholders including Trafford MBC and the Friends of Longford Park group in order to determine the best location over the past 12 months and have had to take into account a number of considerations and constraints when determining its location.

The chosen location and alignment of the track borders the green wedge proposed as part of the proposed residential scheme and, whilst we have no objection to the principal of development across the former MMU site, are keen to ensure this development does not impact or prevent the delivery (or subsequent operation) of our own community track.

We would welcome (and are keen to) engage in further dialogue with the design team on our proposals and would draw your attention to our facebook page ([Longford BMX](#)) for further information on the project.

MMU are a rich organisation - they have no need to develop this site. I am totally opposed to any building on Ryebank Fields.

I see no school or doctor. address infrastructure please.

Traffic and parking on Longford Road is very problematic and, at times, unsafe for children. Whilst we don't object to the development of the site, it would be sensible to have it as a contained development with no houses facing on to Longford Road. this would mean that the onstreet parking remains to be relieved by the absence of houses on the north side of the road. This is a critical space to relieve pressure of parking and passing traffic.

As far as I can see, from this poor drawings, I don't feel the increment in the volume traffic around the area has been considered at all. When I went to the consultation and I asked about it, the person there told me that the traffic issue will be considered but he said he didn't know exactly what measurements they would take, which, for me, it is an unacceptable answer.

The issue of traffic in Longford Road is already a big problem especially at school ours, due to Oswald Road and St. John's Schools, so if we get at least 140 more cars circulating down that road is going to make things even worse for residents and children attending those schools. If this development goes ahead the most important this is to solve this, more than judging how the houses are going to be distributed inside that area. In my opinion, the drawings, only show different layouts of the same idea.

I am responding to the consultation on the development of Ryebank Road. I live on Longford Road.

In principle I have nothing against the building of houses on this site. I think it is important to build on brown-field sites, and it is undeniable that there is a serious shortage of houses. I am less convinced that this proposal addresses the needs of local people, and those who do not have half a million pounds with which to buy a house. But that's another issue!

I do have serious concerns about the plans though, specifically around what this will mean in terms of additional traffic in an area that is already struggling with this issue. Longford Road already cannot cope with the volume of traffic at school drop-off and pick-up time. With Oswald Road primary school at the top of the road, and St John's RC primary school on Longford Road there is considerable additional traffic between 8am and 9am and between 3.15 and 4.15pm. And the road cannot cope, not least because two vehicles cannot pass each other on the road. While most traffic travels down Longford Road from East to West, all it takes is for one vehicle to try to travel in the opposite direction (West to East) for there to be a complete deadlock. It is no exaggeration to say this happens every day. And the result of this is frayed tempers (I have seen countless people arguing over who should give way, including people getting out their cars and shouting and swearing at each other – all in front of all the kids); people trying to squeeze into car parking spots at the side of the road that are too small (my car has been damaged three times in such incidents since I have lived here); and a general danger to pedestrians and others (two cats have been run over in the last couple of years, for example). So, the road just cannot cope now, which really begs the question how it would cope with the traffic coming from 70 new homes (would we be looking at 120 extra cars, plus?).

One potential solution would be to make Longford Road one way (from East to West). A number of residents have already spoken to St John's primary school about this, but the plan has not been met with support. Even that, however, would not sort the problem out entirely because vehicles then find it hard to move from the end of Ryebank Road onto Wilbraham Road (turning right/west towards Stretford).

Another way of tackling this problem would be to reconsider the access to this new development. In particular, I would like to see reconsideration of the idea that all traffic should access this development from the south side (i.e. from the end of Longford Road) and not also on the north side (the other Rye Bank Road, leading on to Great Stone Road). There are no primary schools there, and there seems to be more capacity to absorb this extra traffic. Even if half the new houses had access to/from Rye Bank Road (onto Great Stone Road) this would be much preferable to the current proposals.

The only other thing I would add is a plea for you to take the views of local residents seriously in this consultation. It is easy to be cynical and to think that all decisions have already been made and that this consultation is, like many others, just a box-ticking exercise. So please don't let it be just that. Thank you.

Access will be the key issue here. Two accesses would seem to make sense to the north and south, however if it was a through route then it could become a rat run and may need wider improvements to the road network beyond the site.

I don't have strong opinions on the size, layout etc, but I do see a need to improve the housing stock, and council tax base in Chorlton/Manchester. People work here, use our services and then swan off back to Trafford and Cheshire. The only other part of the city I can think of with high quality housing is Didsbury. Chorlton should have some high-end housing too - especially if the precinct and baths developments will have affordable housing for existing residents.

Just wish I could afford to live in the Ryebank development!

Feedback from Oswald Road Primary School;

We note with great interest the development proposals to Chorlton Precinct, Ryebank Road and Chorlton Leisure Centre including the potential for around 290 new dwellings.

The developments triangulate Oswald Road and St. John's Primary Schools, providing for a combined 1,200 pupils locally and sharing axial routes to Longford, Nicolas and Oswald Roads. We strongly recommend;

The Community's Needs

1 Creation of a Masterplan for "Chorlton North"

- Assessing the cumulative impact and opportunity of the 3 developments
- In context of the Chorlton Plan (2009)
- Resulting in a focussed local Action Plan with key recommendations

2 Prioritising the Local Environment

- Major improvements to public realm and highways are required including;
 - o Child friendly, pedestrian priority and traffic calming measures
 - o Improved access to public transport Chorlton Metrolink and Bus services
 - o Creation of a holistic parking strategy for Chorlton, not just the Precinct
 - o Creation of a cycling strategy for Chorlton

The School's Needs

3 Controlling Vehicular Traffic

- Nicolas, Oswald and Longford Roads experience heavy traffic flows. Encourage traffic flows away from these roads and prioritise children, pedestrians and cyclists
- Create defined parent drop off / pick up area to, for example, the new Manchester Road as a circular route.
- Encouraging walking and cycling to School and Work;
 - o Create new Zebra crossings encouraging safe access across; Longford Road towards Field of Os, Nicolas Road towards Chorlton centre, Oswald Road towards the community and café
 - o Creation of dedicated cycle lanes and parking
- Parking agreement within the new Precinct car park for School use

4 Improving the School Environment

- The School currently meet less than 25% of Department for Education outdoor space guidelines
- The majority of the outdoor grounds are tarmac resulting in injuries and limiting outdoor activities
- The School requires an urgent upgrade of School outdoor play, sports and recreation areas
- Field of Os presents an opportunity as multi-sports pitch including new secure boundary fencing

Finally - could the proposed developments contribute annually to a local "charitable Fund" supporting, for example, School, Community and Public improvements for the long term?

As a major local stakeholder, we look forward to driving these proposals forward in partnership with the Council, developers, St John's Primary School our community and its children.

- Headteacher, Oswald Road Primary School

As a resident of Longford Rd I have grave concerns about the strains this development will make on an already overstretched infrastructure.

My biggest concern is traffic on Longford Rd which is already an issue with two primary schools on the street.

The new development would definitely need 2 access roads and Longford Rd would need to be one way.

All Chorlton schools are full with no spare capacity.

There are already serious issues with drains and sewage

There is industrial waste including asbestos in the site which is located near a primary school

I accept we need new homes but think this site cannot support as many as 70. We need imaginative eco friendly design representing the spirit of Chorlton. We need affordable housing not a gated luxury development. A car pool located here would reduce stress on the roads. Possibly housing for elderly residents who won't need school places. The quality of these sketched proposals are very poor and do not inspire confidence

If this scheme must go ahead then access should be from both Ryebank Rd in the north and south and not connect through. Also given the current traffic issues on Longford Rd the road should be made one way from Oswald Rd to Ryebank Rd. Houses on the new development should be only 2 storeys high and not front on to Longford Rd.

It is very important that a significant portion of the housing is affordable housing

This piece of land is not waste land. It is used and valued by the local community. It is a beautiful piece of seasonal grassland with young trees and a wide variety of insect, plant biodiversity and a home for bats. Digging up the land and building new houses will not increase biodiversity it will categorically reduce it. When this green space is gone it will be gone forever. This country does have a housing crisis however the housing which is described in your plans is not targeted with a view to alleviating this to groups who are most in need of housing which may be the only argument which could justify the destruction of this wild space. I propose that this land is declared common land and kept wild and continues to enrich the lives of future generations.

Currently Ryebank road and Longford, Newport and Nicolas roads and relatively quiet as a result of not being through roads. I would be categorically opposed to the only access to your housing development being from Longford Road or for Ryebank road becoming a through road. I am concerned about the impact of building noise which would be prolonged if the plan goes ahead to build 70 houses. If there is not adequate parking this will impact on parking on the surrounding streets. As these are planned to be family homes I am concerned about the impact on demand for local school places. In addition traffic on Longford road is already a problem as it is narrow and has 2 primary schools on or close to it. I think that this development will put this under further pressure. Most of all I am saddened that this beautiful place will be lost and urge you to reconsider the option of leaving it be as a wild community space.

I am opposed to any development on this site. Ryebank Field is an amazing wild green space used by the community. Homes can be built elsewhere but the field can not be replaced.

I think the proposal for new homes will also cause pressure on local schools and exacerbate the existing traffic difficulties on Longford Road and Oswald Road around school opening/closing time.

Instead of asking which plan is a preferred option I think the consultation questionnaire ought to have the option of no development at all.

The proposal would change the amenity of the area which is really peaceful and quiet and by removing a beautiful green space.

I always walk in this bit of the park and it is my absolutely favourite part of the park. I don't want this development to go ahead I want this to stay as green space. Walking in this part of the park helps me to relax and enjoy living here. Please don't take it away with building houses which will make it busier and more difficult to drive through in the morning and afternoons it is already too busy because of the schools and it's really tight spaces because of the cars on both sides. My opinion is that no houses should be built and it should stay as it is!

Please do not develop this site. Everyone I have spoken to who lives locally is opposed to it.

Please do not destroy the field. Lots of people walk here every day. It is the best bit of the park.

The plans will also create more problems with the morning traffic around the two local primary schools.

Issues to consider

- school places
- if this is made a through road then it will be used as a cut through, this would make the roads around Ryebank rd much busier. Also a lot of children pass through on the way to primary schools, congestion and traffic could increase risk of accidents
- massively increased traffic congestion on really narrow roads particularly at school opening and closing times
- further stretch on on street parking on Ryebank, Longford, Newport and Nicolas roads
- I love this piece of land and walk my dog on it most days. I really don't want it to be lost. It is so pretty in the summer with the long grass and wild flowers and I really like the beautiful silver leaved trees.

Is the mix of 3-, 4- and 5-bedroom houses appropriate? Will there sufficient affordable homes and "starter homes" in the mix? It isn't clear that these are being provided for but they need to be considered.

It is important that the permeability of the site for walkers and cyclists is designed and maintained into the future, giving good-quality through routes. Will these be designed in such a way that they cannot be obstructed by, e.g. irresponsible car parking, or by residents who try to "gate off" their area?

This development must ensure that sustainable transport is strongly promoted. For example, there is mention of off-road car-parking but no mention of residential bicycle storage or street bicycle hangers (e.g. <https://www.salford.gov.uk/parking-roads-and-travel/cycling/residential-bike-hangars/>, <https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/parking-transport-and-streets/cycling/cycle-parking-scheme-guide>, <https://southwarkcyclists.org.uk/cycle-parking-guide/>). Why are these not mentioned? If you plan to make the private car the easiest thing to use then that is what people will use, generating all the associated environmental and congestion impacts. If you make sustainable transport options the easiest thing to use then that is what people will use.

I live on Longford Road directly opposite Ryebank Fields. Given the determination of Manchester Met and now the council to build on the fields, I am not completely opposed to a low density housing development. However, I do have some key objections to the plans as proposed.

More realistic thought given to traffic management.

There must be more than one access road.

The development should be self contained, keeping the trees that border Longford Road.

Traffic

All local residents are aware of the present traffic problems during periods 08:30-09:15 and 15:30-16:15. Longford Road is long and narrow where cars are parked on both sides. The two nearby schools generate so much traffic that it is impossible for residents to move in and out of the street. St Johns school operate a voluntary one way system to try and help with this but frequently the road becomes grid locked.

A development creating 70 houses with up to 3 bedrooms will greatly add to this peak time traffic pressure. The proposal states that residents will largely use public transport. In the real world many of those residents will use their cars adding to what is already very difficult for residents.

The proposal states that a car park might be provided for St Johns School. The head teacher has had no such offer or indeed been asked for her thoughts.

Building houses on Longford Road with driveways will only add to the present congestion and lack of parking particularly at the peak times. There will be less space to park and for cars to pass. This will push the problem onto surrounding streets.

One access road?

The university and the council have made no secret of their preference for one access road so as to maximise the value of the houses as Chorlton homes. This seems a very poor reason for adding the already difficult traffic conditions that exist on Longford Road and Ryebank Road. The inconvenient truth is that two access roads makes sense as it will lessen the impact of increased traffic this development will bring. I am in favour of it not being a through road but rather two cul de sacs.

Residents are aware that the person involved in assessing traffic actually lives on Ryebank Road on the Trafford side, the road that would be effected if a second access road were built. While I make no judgement on his professionalism this does seem like a huge conflict of interest.

The council's own key policies state that developments should pay particular regard for 'road safety and traffic generation....vehicular access and car parking.' (Manchester Core Strategy)

And that safe routes to school 'should be intergral to new development schemes.' This development can only add to already high volumes of traffic at peak times as well as the additional hazard of children walking across the driveways of the proposed homes on Longford Road.

Self contained development?

The current proposals include plans for homes to be built along Longford Road with their own driveways. This will reduce the current parking space both because of the driveways and the fact that most of these houses will have more than one vehicle and will end up being parked on the road. If the development were self contained then the trees could be preserved and some of the traffic/parking problems would be eased.

The council's own 'Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy 2015' places great importance on street trees and their role in enhancing the environment and neighbourhood. It states that "Manchester and its stakeholders will improve the quality and function of existing green and blue infrastructure to maximise the benefits it delivers and use appropriate green and blue infrastructure as a key component of new developments to help create successful neighbourhoods."

The 'Guide to Development in Manchester Supplementary Planning Document and Planning Guidance' crucially states that safe routes to school 'should be integral to new development schemes' and that 'New developments will fit more easily into their surroundings if they incorporate existing landscapes and there will be a presumption to retain existing trees.'

The consultation

The accuracy and quality of the plan drawings are woeful and amount to nothing more than sketches.

It seems that in an effort to make the development appear largely green space, none of the hard standing such as driveways, pavements or parking areas has been represented.

There is only an option for the maximum storeys to be 3. I would prefer 2 which isn't in keeping with the surrounding houses.

The entrance to the development is in fact in the wrong place in question 1, option 4. It also gives the entirely false impression that the development is self contained. This was pointed out to the council by another resident but was allowed to be included in the consultation process. Attempting to make this point at a consultation session the developers representative said it was the council's responsibility. Across the room, the council's representative said it was nothing to do with them despite this process being hosted and administered by them.

The council should remember that this land was gifted by them to the university for sport and leisure and as such this places a special responsibility on them to influence the nature of this development.

any development of the Ryebank Road site will impact greatly on us. Our back garden, rear elevation of the house and all the habitable room windows face out onto and over the north border of the site.

Whilst our starting point is that we would rather not see any development on the fields at all - we have some specific concerns.

There are many clusters and copses of trees and woodland around the edges of the site and those that flank our boundary present a denser wooded screen. We are very concerned that development brings with it a need to build drainage and lighting and other utility connections to surrounding water, gas and electricity grids and that any houses, roads and infrastructure will require the removal of the trees that keep our garden private, or damage the root systems of the denser self-seeded copses, harming their health and their biodiversity value, and potentially resulting in their death or removal.

We object on the strongest grounds to any masterplan that advocates a reduction in the woodland, trees or other green buffers around the edge of the site, and in particular those nearest us. We would also want any master plan to place a strong emphasis on the need for any future developer to follow the policy aims of the National Planning Policy Framework and increase the biodiversity functions of the site by supplementing and adding new trees, planting and flora to the existing ones on site.

The trees offer a softer buffer between the existing residential properties and any potential future development, which should be enhanced not compromised. Any new windows in new houses or other buildings should not face existing windows in our or our neighbour's houses. Given the existing situation, any new-window-to-existing-window interface distance should be in significant excess of the standard suburban aim of 21m.

Since MMU's decision to no longer tend the Ryebank fields site, the natural wildlife has bloomed significantly. There are a great number of varied birds nesting in the copses around the perimeter of the site. Additionally, an American Robin, sited rarely in the UK, was recently reported to the RSPB. Furthermore, earlier this week, at around 9am, I witnessed a fox emerge from the site and enter my own and my neighbours garden, then return moments later. I believe this unusual daylight sighting demonstrates how well established the local wildlife has become. Any new development would undoubtedly threaten this, rare and invaluable suburban wildlife hotspot.

At the back of our property, there now exists a beautiful copse of silver birch trees, which over the years of use by the local community has developed into a unique tree tunnel, running parallel to the site border. Whilst providing a natural wooded screen to our garden, the significant root system will undeniably be helping the natural drainage of the site, which does have a very high-water table.

We express a reluctant preference for Option 4, on the grounds that a similar road layout would appear to discourage through traffic and offer a lower density/number of units.

We formally request that a suitably qualified officer of the Council visit the site and investigate the potential for the mature trees along the boundary with our land be considered for designation with either individual Tree Preservation Orders, or at the very least, a group TPO to offer some protection ahead of actual planning applications being submitted.

We ask that you thoroughly consider the need for passage of scrubland / trees at the north border, similar to the proposed border with Longford park. This will not only benefit the desirability of the proposed new houses but also existing houses such as our own.

We formally request that a member of the planning team visit us at our property to appreciate our vantage point and our concerns.

Our other concerns, which we would appreciate a response to, are listed below:

1. Removal of trees, as outlined above.

2. Access to Rye Bank Road. We object in the strongest possible terms to the option of having vehicle access to Rye Bank Road. The possibility of a through road to Longford Road needs to be absolutely rejected, to avoid a 'rat-run' between the Stretford / M60 junction 7 and North Chorlton/ Firswood.

3. Traffic. Even if you were to pursue an option without a through road, the impact of traffic in the immediate vicinity and further afield would be huge. Current traffic hotspots which would be impacted include: the junction of Kensington Road and Barlow Moor Road; the Quadrant roundabout; the junction of Kings Road and Edge Lane; the junction of Great Stone Road and Talbot Road; the impact on traffic on the well being of pupils at 2 very local primary schools (St Teresa's and St Hilda's). The junction of Ryebank Road and Great Stone Road would have to have a pedestrian crossing built to ensure the safety of the many school children walking up to St Teresa's school and St Hilda's school, and for the extra pedestrians using the route to walk up to Firswood tram stop. Has there been a traffic survey and has such plans been considered? 70 houses could mean at least 140 more cars using the roads,

most likely at rush hour.

Have you had an Impact Analysis for the increased traffic and if so please can we see it? Are you considering the need to put in more pedestrian crossings in the local area to promote safe walking in the community?

3. Drainage. The area of the proposed development is at a very high water table. The drainage in our garden, the playing field of Longford Park and the surrounding area is terrible. What plans have you got to minimise the inevitable drainage problems that will be incurred from developing the site into so many homes?

4. Proposed 3 storey houses. Our house is a 2 storey – can you advise whether the houses on the north border of the site are proposed as 3 storey? We object to this on the grounds of privacy and light.

5. Pollution caused by the development. As an old, pre-1930s landfill site, before any waste regulations were introduced, it is safe to assume that there will be some contamination in the soil. Once excavated, this risks (such as methane gas) leaking into water sources in the surrounding area. What consideration has been given to this and can you provide any evidence that will reassure us?

We have 2 small children and the development of the site will cause pollution to us for a protracted amount of time – both noise pollution; air pollution and possible toxic substances released into the air. Our enjoyment of our home and garden will be significantly compromised for the duration of the building work. Do the council and the developers recognise this, and what will you offer to minimise this?

We look forward to your detailed, written, reply at your earliest convenience.

Traffic flow/air quality/ quality of life for residents in the surrounding area.

The Development framework identifies 4 options, all of which identify Longford Road as the sole/ main vehicle exit with one option offering the possibility of an emergency vehicle exit via north Ryebank Road ' only if it is possible'

Consultation sessions revealed there has been NO IMPACT STUDY on the effects on traffic flow to Longford/ Newport/Nicholas and Ryebank Roads.

Because of the huge impact the increased traffic will have on air quality and quality of life for existing residents of this area a traffic impact study should be a CENTRAL CONSIDERATION that informs any decisions re the number and position of exits from the site.

Much is made of the high quality of setting and environment for the residents of the new development but absolutely NO mention is made regarding the detriment to the environment in terms of air pollution/traffic flow and quality of life for the existing residents of the adjoining areas. Instead, we have been informed at 'consultations' that this will be done once the layout is formalized.

I feel this is totally unacceptable. Local residents have a moral right to equal consideration. Why should the effect of the increased traffic on our environment be expendable and tacked on as a potential 'impact study after the final plans have been agreed?

My calculation is that 70-72 properties, 52 of which will be 4-5 bedroom houses, will have an average of approx. 3 cars each, including couples and adult children, making regular use by 216 additional cars, using the Longford Road exit.

Representatives at the consultation minimized the effect by calculating that the majority of this traffic will be at peak times, which will in itself have a massive detrimental effect on the Longford Road vicinity. It does not account for all the additional associated traffic from visitors/friends and family, food delivery vans, and those not employed using their cars during the daytime, nor for weekends when there will be a huge increase in vehicles using this already congested area in addition to the parked cars of current residents which already make road access difficult.

The current traffic flow situation is that there are two schools in the immediate area, one on Longford Road, which already severely effect traffic flow during peak hours, and the Sports Stadium in Longford Park where regular events are held. The exit onto Edge Lane from Ryebank Road South is already very difficult during peak hours, and will additional use, even longer queues will develop increasing air pollution with idling engines. It is inevitable that extra traffic flow will

attempt to avoid this bottleneck by using surrounding roads and increasing the pressure there.

If the development is to go ahead it makes much more sense to have two exits, on Ryebank Road North, to spread the impact, but this has not been offered as an option.

It seems clear that MMU wants to build just one exit, on the Longford Road side. Is this, as widely rumoured, to maximise the sale value of the properties by having a Chorlton address, or to avoid a cost implication for the use of a Trafford exit?

The development proposes low density, larger family housing in a traditional design. Providing higher density smaller homes for older people who want to downsize, particularly if some of it were to be affordable, would free up existing under occupied family homes. An age friendly development would also have the benefit of meeting design standards that enable older people to live more independently and safely and reduce some of the burden on health budgets.

Having worked with the School of Architecture at MMU on age friendly research over a number of years, we believe the site offers an ideal opportunity to deliver to deliver an innovative development that challenges existing design principles and supports the GM Age Friendly Spatial Framework proposals.

Southway would be interested in working with MMU on proposals to deliver affordable and age friendly homes in this area.

Ryebank fields in its current 'unmanaged' condition is a fantastic refuge for wildlife. Loss of this habitat would have a severe negative impact on the local bird and insect population. Manchester City already has one of the lowest areas of Green Space of any major UK city and cannot afford to lose this valuable resource.

The Nico Ditch is a scheduled Ancient Monument in other parts of the City and this section deserves the same protection; it would make an excellent educational resource.

Contrary to MMU's views the fields are well used by the local population and there is no barrier between the site and adjacent Longford Park. Creating housing on the site would actually decrease access to Longford Park.

The site was given to MMU for recreational purposes and it is still used as such by local walkers and cross-country runners. It should remain as open space with free access to the residents of the City for recreational purposes.

The local infrastructure cannot cope with the additional homes proposed. Longford Road already serves two local schools and suffers from severe traffic congestion during the 'school run' period; this congestion has resulted in damage to local residents vehicles and makes emergency vehicle access impossible. Seventy new 'executive homes' would probably result in circa 100 extra 'executive' vehicles also trying to access Longford Road and Ryebank Road at peak times. A single access point to the development from Longford Road would cause traffic chaos, be dangerous for local school children and potential loss of life resulting from lack of access for the emergency services.

Local schools cannot cope with existing pupil numbers and local GP surgeries also struggle; I recently had a three week wait for a GP appointment at Chorlton Family Practice. The surface water drainage on Longford Road currently struggles to cope during periods of heavy rain and is frequently under water. The increased runoff from new housing would exacerbate this problem.

In summary the proposed development of Ryebank Fields is totally unsuitable.

I am absolutely opposed to any building on Ryebank Fields. My understanding is that the land was given to the then Manchester Polytechnic on the understanding that it be used for recreational purposes. Any building would, obviously, be in contradiction of this covenant.

In addition, I feel this is a sham consultation given the number of questions with no or limited alternatives. For example, if this has to be built and we have to lose another green space, then there should be no access from Longford Road/Ryebank Road. This area is already gridlocked at school pick up and drop off, and whenever there is a meeting at Stratford Stadium. Having vehicular access on to Longford Road will exacerbate this, will lead to greater pollution and will pose further risks to children walking to the two schools close by. I am deeply concerned that a proposal which poses risks to children is even being considered. If we have to lose a popular green space, any traffic should enter and exit via Rye Banks Road to the North. It is wider than Longford Road and a short stretch to Greatstone Road; a road much better able to deal with the increased traffic. This logical route is not given as an option in questions 2 or 3, and question 6 leads the responder to assume that this will not be considered. I am also concerned at a possible conflict of interest here given that someone involved in the (questionable) traffic survey apparently lives on Rye Bank Road.

Furthermore, the question concerning height does not give the option of two storeys. The majority of houses in the area are two storey. If this has to go ahead then any buildings should be limited to two storey.

A number of issues are not addressed by this consultation process, for example:

The two schools in the immediate area are already full, despite Oswald Road having recently expanded to three-form entry, and yet there is no provision for a new school;

It currently takes up to two weeks to get an appointment at Chorlton Health Centre, and yet there is no provision for extra doctors;

The Victorian/Edwardian drainage system is already creaking and will struggle to cope with the extra pressures created by more homes.

Finally, Ryebank Fields is a popular green space used by dog walkers, children and others. It seems inconceivable that Manchester City Council would consider losing such a space in what is an already densely packed suburb.

The proposed development framework identifies a requirement for 'much needed new houses in Chorlton' and identifies these as being for a 'high quality residential area providing high quality of life for it's residents'. This should surely be the aim of

I am very worried about the extra traffic/car journeys the development will create, especially at peak times when Longford Road is already heavily congested and double parking creates serious problems. Peak school times are already a nightmare for residents and 70 extra homes in close proximity will add to the existing problems.

A single access to the site from Longford Road cannot be desirable - you will create a funnel for vehicle access, leading out onto what is already a very congested road. I think there should be access from Ryebank Road (Stretford) as well to create a through road.

I am also concerned about the cutting down of trees and destruction of habitat that developing the site will result in. The fields are home to a large amount of wildlife and this will destroy natural habitat.

1. I am totally opposed to the plans to build an estate at the end of my road, Newport Road.

1. I am a home owner and lived on Newport Road for 17 years, and Claridge Road before that 11 years. Parking and congestion was not a problem until past few years. Due to bigger vehicles e.g. jeeps! trees on pavements, so less parking on pavement, many addresses have more than one car owner, it is a nightmare trying to drive down my own road often, being a long road, especially if another vehicle, or van, truck or several vehicles trying to pass the other side of road, then there is no space to give way, then I have vehicles behind me waiting to drive down the road etc!! in the dark, wet slippery road even worse. The architect at 'consultancy', tried suggested parking permits!!! this is really not an option, and he is not aware that not everyone can afford parking permits, and why should we pay to park outside our own houses. I already pay £100 per month council tax. I am now unwaged and can't get to speak to universal credit to make a claim!! Also with Oswald Road school at bottom of Newport Road, there is often worse congestion there, start and end of school day, (there is also St John's school on Longford!!)

2. Executive homes: Why do we need more people with good incomes, taking more school places, using our NHS doctors and dentists?.. when Oswald Road surgery closed last year and 6,000 patients including me were transferred to Chorlton Family practice who already have a similar number of patients. No facilities for all those extra residents. What about social housing? What about building homes that are council owned or housing association? There are very little options for people on benefits or low income rents with protected tenancies.

3. I think having executive homes could attract potential criminals, as would seem a wealthy area.

4. More dog walkers, and dog excrement and dogs!!

5. I believe this will seriously affect the value of my house, as there will be really bad congestion. Also if you make it permit holders only where house holders have to pay for permits this could affect prospective buyers buying.

I strongly object to the proposals to build on Ryebank Fields. However, if the development does have to go ahead then I am very concerned that it is proposed to access via the south (Longford Road/Ryebank Road). There are two schools close by, the pollution is already bad and the increased traffic will make this worse. The traffic is already atrocious at school drop off and pick up (and whenever there is an event at Stratford Stadium). Both of these factors pose a significant threat to the health and safety of local children. For this reason any access should be via Rye Bank Road to the North. This short stretch is wider than Longford Road and leads on to Greatstone Road, a road much better suited to the increase in traffic.

I am very much opposed to the development of the site if creates exclusive and executive homes - or any sense of a gated community - or a development that is driven primarily by maximising the profit from the sale of the land. There are very strong opinions locally about the green space and the use of this land and any exclusive "executive style" development is likely to be strongly opposed.

There are already SERIOUS TRAFFIC PROBLEMS on Longford road and surrounding roads that have NOT been taken into proper consideration in the proposals and this should be an absolute pre-requirement before planning permission is granted. There should be NO development or parking directly onto Longford road and the trees on that side of the land (not shown on the plans) should be protected. Traffic problems will be alleviated if access is provided through the top (Trafford side) and bottom of the site but without through access. Developing 3-5 bed exec housing is likely to result in multiple car occupancy and make the traffic problems worse - whatever the implausible statistics offered during the consultations!

There are also infrastructure and service problems - drainage issues on Longford & lack of school places - that need to be addressed as part of any planning proposals. Adding more houses will exacerbate these problems.

If MMU is to have local support for any building or development on Ryebank files it must address a development that reflects and serves Chorlton's character and community - the current proposals for executive style housing does not do that. The development, if it goes ahead, needs to enhance the community and physical infrastructure and deliver safe and sustainable transport and access.

I share the view of many local residents that Chorlton's distinctiveness must be given the highest priority by the Council and the landowner when considering the most appropriate form of development for Ryebank Fields. Chorlton's residents are creative and proactive and, given the opportunity to participate in the vision for the development of the area's last large residential development plot, will undoubtedly provide inspiration and ideas that could lead to the delivery of a genuinely innovative and distinctive development. Also that that the development should be tailored to Chorlton and that a development of executive housing that may have worked well in Didsbury should not simply copied and pasted onto the Ryebank Fields site. A much wider range of house types and sizes is required for this site to adequately reflect the needs of the community.

The proposals currently focus exclusively on 'executive' homes for private sale. As well as owner occupied properties, it is important that the development should include affordable starter homes and rented accommodation, including an element of social housing, all of which are urgently needed in the area.

The development should aim to achieve exemplary standards of sustainable design, which would be as near carbon neutral as possible. Opportunities for on-site low and zero carbon energy production should be investigated, along with water reducing or recycling technologies. Buildings should also be highly insulated and oriented to maximise solar gain to minimise the need for heating. This would also help towards the council's stated aims of achieving a 100% clean energy city by 2050. Another stated aim in the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 is to be at the forefront on environmental initiatives and mitigating climate change; this site provides an opportunity to deliver part of that promise. I strongly urge MCC and MMU to focus on engaging with a development partner or partners who share this commitment to genuinely sustainable development.

Finally, if any development does proceed, it should involve and represent local voice and local opinion and MCC and MMU should be strongly encouraged to find a way to achieve this.

While I have with the questions laid out in the survey (as I felt saying I disagreed would imply I wanted fewer houses), I would say that given the demand for housing the size of area, it seems a missed opportunity not to attempt to build a few more appropriate looking mansion blocks (four or five stories, found in many European cities but strangely absent in the UK) built in unobtrusive areas of the land. Part of Britain's housing problem is due to lack of density, and it seems a missed opportunity to miss out on addressing this given the excellent location/transport links.

I would like to note that I think this area should be preserved as green open space for the local community. There are few green spaces available in Manchester, once a green space is built on it is unlikely that it will ever be restored. In a highly built up area this is a highly valued scarce resource for the local community.

As the site is at risk of flooding, we have concerns regarding flooding to surrounding properties should the site be built on. It's vital that appropriate drainage is ensured and insurance should be purchased to resolve any subsequent problems for surrounding properties.

Appropriate planting of high quality trees should be planned for areas other than adjacent to Longford Park to improve drainage and to improve outlook for the surrounding neighbours.

We have concerns regarding disruption to local residents from a significant and long lasting construction site.

Construction methods that will reduce impact on the local residents should be prioritised.

There is already high significant population density in the area, we are concerned about the impact on local GP/NHS, education and local authority services.

We are concerned about the suggestion that 3 storey properties are being considered. These will overlook surrounding properties and are not in keeping with the residential properties in the close vicinity. We would suggest that the maximum height for the development is two stories.

In order to maintain an element of green space less than 70 properties should be built to increase the green space available.

I agree with the new Chorlton residents group that there could be far more innovation on the site. That 3,4, and 5 bedrooms is not a diversity of housing types and that tenure choice potentially including self-build as well as provision for single people are also possibilities.

That housing could potentially be more dense while maintaining and enhancing green space and bio-diversity. That any new homes in Chorlton should have very high levels of sustainability eg insulation, solar panels, rain-water collection etc and expectation of reduced car use/ shared electric vehicles.

That co-operative or co-housing should be considered.

**DO NOT AGREE TO ANY BUILDING WHATSOEVER ON THIS SITE. LEAVE IT AS IT IS OPEN AND GREEN!
OKAY, GET THE MESSAGE? NO BUILDING AT ALL!**

Would want to see more starter homes and well designed eco friendly development rather than mock victorian

I have three comments and concerns for this development.

- As far as I'm aware MMU were given this land as a gift. As such I'd like to see some of the money generated by the sale going towards the improvement of local (i.e. specifically Chorlton) facilities and services.

- What consideration has been given to the increased use on local facilities and services have been given. I'm specifically concerned about the local schools and GP services.

- Am very keen that Ryebank Road on the Edge Lane side does not become a 'rat run' if a short cut is created through the new estate from Rye Bank Road on the Firswood side.

I urge the Council and MMU to abandon plans for this area to be converted to a residential development. Instead, the area should be redeveloped as a managed green wild space. This differs from a park by putting ecological and environmental concerns first, rather than aesthetic considerations.

In the event that building goes ahead, I would certainly agree with protecting the Nico Ditch area and existing trees. I would further urge the Council to require that any planned residential development has super-energy-efficient homes e.g. to 'Passivhaus' standard.

We are long-standing residents Ryebank Road, Chorlton, and formerly, Longford Road. As part of the public consultation, we would like to register our concerns regarding the proposed Ryebank Fields (RF) development on the following grounds:-

1. Traffic

The developer's stated preference, option 4, currently proposes routing all traffic in and out of the proposed development via an entrance to the south of the site on the corner of Ryebank / Longford Rd. This is completely unacceptable to existing residents on roads to the south of the site (Ryebank, Longford, Newport and Nicholas) because these roads are:-

Already built up with a high density of residential properties

Congested with on-street parking on both sides

Impacted by severe congestion during school drop off and pick up

Already have traffic calming measures introduced 10-15 years ago to reduce the volume of traffic and deter rat-running from Manchester Road to Edge Lane for the safety of local residents
have additional on-street parking as a result of events at Longford Stadium.

The council's own Policy T1 (traffic) states that the council will support proposals that:

Would reduce the negative impacts of road traffic, for example, congestion, air pollution and road accident casualties. Take account of the needs of road users according to a broad hierarchy consisting of, in order of priority: 1. pedestrians and disabled people, 2. cyclists, 3. public transport, commercial access, 4. general off peak traffic, 5. general peak time traffic.

And the council's Policy DM 1 (Development Management) states that all development should have regard to the following specific issues:

Effects on amenity, including privacy, light, noise, vibration, air quality, odours, litter, vermin, birds, road safety and traffic generation.

Vehicular access and car parking.

Effects relating to biodiversity, landscape, archaeological or built heritage.

Green Infrastructure including open space, both public and private.

In addition, I strongly object to the suggestion from Chorlton Residents' Group that the two ends of Ryebank Road should be re-connected as this would give another opportunity for motorists to cut through from Great Stone Road to Edge Lane. This would be hugely detrimental to the local area and would be a major issue on match days with fans visiting Old Trafford trying to avoid queues on the A56 and seeking ways to cut through to the M60 via Ryebank Road and Edge Lane.

Summary: Option 4 would breach the council's own Policy T1 (traffic) by increasing the negative impact of additional traffic, increasing air pollution and raising the possibility of risk of accidents. It also fails to take into account the effect on priority road users eg the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Option 4 would also require anyone driving from the RF site into Manchester or Salford to travel south down Ryebank Road, along Edge Lane and then north up the A56 Chester Road - an illogical and unnecessary detour.

The developers have made their own assessment on the additional number of car journeys per hour created as a consequence of 74 additional homes based on their own estimate on the likely number of cars per household. There needs to be an independent assessment of these figures as I do not agree with the developer's figures. And I do not accept the developer's argument that many of the new occupiers would travel by public transport - indeed the architect's transport advisor at the drop-in session, who lives on the Trafford end of Ryebank Road, admitted that he drives to work in Salford. And is it not a clear conflict of interest that one of the developer's main advisors is urging people to accept an option for development which would protect him for additional RF traffic???

If, and only if, the council intends to approve plans for RF, I urge the members strongly to reject option 4 and instead, choose an option which creates in effect, two cul-de-sacs, one which routes traffic north into Firswood, other other with an exit/entrance to the south onto Ryebank Road. I would also approve the inclusion of small through routes for pedestrians and cyclists only. Additional traffic and access to the site, would require careful management at peak times, and I would support making Longford and Newport roads one-way in opposite directions.

2. Affordable Housing

The National Planning Policy Framework establishes that the planning system ought to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development. It also requires that local planning authorities should positively seek to meet the development needs of their area.

When a housing developer gets planning permission they are normally required by the council to make a number of the homes they build officially "affordable". The proportion of affordable housing varies but is usually between 30 to 50%.

Such affordable housing is defined as: Social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision.

The RF proposal is for 74 "high value executive homes" and, as such, there is no provision of affordable housing.

Summary: The proposed development fails to meet the need for affordable housing in the area. It also ignores the emphasis of the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework for building new homes on brownfield sites. If the planners' intention is to offset the requirement by building more affordable housing on other developments, I would like some reassurance that a) this is done and b) that the appropriate section 106 funding actually benefits the community around the Ryebank Fields site. If, and only, if this development is agreed, I would urge the council to make it a condition that any new houses on the RF site are owner-occupied and precluded for rental as houses of multiple occupancy would increase traffic volume further.

3. Loss of green space

"Green infrastructure is the network of multifunctional green and blue space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities" (National Planning Policy Framework 2012).

The Manchester Core Strategy 2012-27 defines the green and blue infrastructure as:

Open Spaces - parks, woodlands, informal open spaces (including amenity grass areas, allotments), nature reserves, lakes and reservoirs, historic sites and natural elements of built conservation areas,

civic spaces, accessible countryside, outdoor sports facilities (with natural surfaces)

Linkages - river valleys and canals, pathways, cycle routes, tram routes and railway lines – both used and disused

Networks of "urban green" - the collective resource of private gardens, pocket parks, street trees, verges, green roofs and green walls

While residents of the Ryebank Road are clearly able to enjoy the adjoining Longford Park in neighbouring Trafford, development of the Ryebank Fields site would represent a net loss of green space in the M21 area of Manchester City Council area. Indeed, according to the council's own Parks and Open Space search, the nearest piece of green space in Manchester is Beech Road park - 0.68mi away.

Action 2 of the council's own Green & Blue Infrastructure Strategy states that "enhancing existing parks and green spaces" will "improve health and increase biodiversity" and will be a "key part of city's success over the next 10 years."

Summary: Once Ryebank Fields is built on, this informal green space will be lost forever. This proposed development constitutes a net loss of green space in this part of Manchester and contradicts the city's own core strategy on maintaining green space for the health and wellbeing of its residents.

4. Profit over consideration

The decision to identify option 4 as the preferred option is simply to "maximise development values" by allowing developers to market all 74 properties with a Chorlton postcode. This was admitted quite openly by the architects at a consultation at Oswald Rd Primary School on 2 November.

This reveals a clear and cynical intention by MMU to put profit over their consideration for the community who will be impacted by the proposed development. It shows a lack of respect and consideration for its neighbours.

5. Drainage

The proposed development will create additional run-off of rainwater from 74 homes and consequent driveways and access roads. There are already significant drainage problems in the area, particularly in Longford Park adjoining the site, as a consequence of high clay content in the ground and a high water table.

There is a very real possibility this development could worsen drainage and flooding problems for existing residents. I object on these grounds and would require a full and comprehensive groundwater inspection and an assurance that the RF development does not worsen, and in actual fact, improves local drainage.

6. Biodiversity

There has been assessment of the wildlife on the RF site. I am told it is home to many plants and animals that benefit the wellbeing of residents. Please ensure there is a full and proper assessment on wildlife in the area. And all significant trees on the site must be maintained.

7. Health and education

A careful assessment needs to be done to assess the availability of school places and GPs. There are two schools close by - St John's RC Primary and Oswald Road Primary - but I understand that these schools are at capacity. Likewise, the area has recently lost a GP surgery at Oswald Medical Practice and the development would burden the existing Chorlton Family Practice even further.

Conclusion:

The Ryebank Fields site was bequeathed in the 1950s by Manchester City Council to the then Manchester Polytechnic - now MMU - on the strict condition that it should only be used for sporting activities. MMU now proposes to ignore this requirement, and sell it for profit to a developer who wishes to build 74 high value executive homes on a much needed piece of green space in this part of Manchester.

To make this matter worse, the developer proposes directing all additional traffic through one entrance/exit onto Longford Road/ Ryebank Road, an area which is already / densely populated/ double parked / has two schools / is severely congested by school traffic.

The development is unsuitable for the location as it impacts negatively on local amenities and roads in contravention of the council's own policies T1 and DM1, as well as its Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy and national requirements on the provision of affordable housing. It also increases the risk of drainage problems in an area and threatens local wildlife.

However, we understand the need for additional housing and would support a sustainable development of high quality (but not executive), environmental, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom houses on the RF site some of which are more affordable. These new properties should be made owner-occupier only, and precluded from rental or buy-to-let schemes. It is VITAL that traffic access to the site should be split north and south to split the load. And there should be small through-routes connecting the two cul-de-sacs permitting pedestrian and cycling access across the site. There must be no additional burden on drainage and sewerage - in fact, I would like to see some of the £160 million spent on improving local drainage which is already an issue. And all significant trees should be maintained.

We can understand that MMU wishes to make the maximum profit on the sale of its land for development but this should not be achieved at the expense and detriment of existing residents. Manchester City councillors have a duty to represent our interests and I urge them to consider the impact - especially traffic - on local residents and their families, the local environment and the wider Chorlton community.

I am absolutely opposed to any building on Ryebank Fields. My understanding is that the land was given to the then Manchester Polytechnic on the understanding that it be used for recreational purposes. Any building would, obviously, be in contradiction of this covenant.

In addition, I feel this is a sham consultation given the number of questions with no or limited alternatives. For example, if this has to be built and we have to lose another green space, then there should be no access from Longford Road/Ryebank Road. This area is already gridlocked at school pick up and drop off, and whenever there is a meeting at Stratford Stadium. Having vehicular access on to Longford Road will exacerbate this, will lead to greater pollution and will pose further risks to children walking to the two schools close by. I am deeply concerned that a proposal which poses risks to children is even being considered. If we have to lose a popular green space, any traffic should enter and exit via Rye Banks Road to the North. It is wider than Longford Road and a short stretch to Greatstone Road; a road much better able to deal with the increased traffic. This logical route is not given as an option in questions 2 or 3, and question 6 leads the responder to assume that this will not be considered. I am also concerned at a possible conflict of interest here given that someone involved in the (questionable) traffic survey apparently lives on Rye Bank Road.

Furthermore, the question concerning height does not give the option of two storeys. The majority of houses in the area are two storey. If this has to go ahead then any buildings should be limited to two storey.

A considerable number of issues are not addressed by this consultation process:

The two schools in the immediate area are already full, despite Oswald Road having recently expanded to three-form entry, and yet there is no provision for a new school;

It currently takes up to two weeks to get an appointment at Chorlton Health Centre, and yet there is no provision for extra doctors;

The Victorian/Edwardian drainage system is already creaking and struggle to cope with the extra pressures created by more homes.

Finally, Ryebank Fields is a popular green space used by dog walkers, children and others. It seems inconceivable that an allegedly environmentally committed Manchester City Council would consider losing such a space in what is an already densely packed suburb.

This response to the formal consultation on the three areas of proposed Development Framework in Chorlton, the Precinct, Ryebank Rd and the site of the former Leisure Centre is submitted on behalf of all three councillors in Chorlton Park ward, Councillor Mandie Shilton Godwin, Councillor Dave Rawson and Councillor Joanna Midgley.

We are concerned that the current proposals for homes on Ryebank Road will create unacceptable levels of traffic congestion.

We do not think that to develop such large homes is an appropriate development. What is required here is housing which is more in keeping with the rest of the area, and which fronts onto Longford Park. This area of land would really lend itself to development of a more normal mixed community including homes for older people. This would not, however, mitigate the traffic issue, which is very significant indeed. It would make sense then not to develop the whole site but to leave some pending discussions with Trafford related to access at the north side in Trafford.

There are bats and ? badgers etc on this site which should be protected whatever happening to it. We need green spaces. Houses/flats (affordable) Should be built on Brown Field sites. This area has ? broken up 2nd World War air raid shelters below it. (But not a brown field site)! and could be prone to flooding.

What does Trafford think (on one side)?

Re question 2 Where is the option for 'none' of the above?

Too many cars on green land, Chorlton and Stretford can't sustain the current amount of traffic. I live on the North Rye Bank Cul de Sac. This proposition appals me.

Too many houses traffic on lonford rd is already often dangerous and over crowded due to excising access to st johns school and events on here twice daley jams. Ryabank rd and longford rd id already used as a rat run from edge lane. adding over 200 people will make traffic unbearable and not safe.

There are too many houses i would like to have a place to enjoy nature. Longford road is already at breaking point with am accident waiting to happen. The extra housing will put pressure already busy area and on local residents. I have used Ryabank fields as a place to run,walk and enjoy. We do not have enough green space in chorlton and longford park is in trafford. We need to be protecting our nature areas not just building on them for profit. We need a longer term strategy to reduce pollution, congestion and the danger on the road. Consider the well-being of the people

Any new development must include housing and parking for the number of new occupants in each household ie at least two off road spaces. And not lead treffic on to the neighbouring roads especially Ryebank rd and longford rd. In addition the developer must be made to meet the need for more school, doctors and dental.

I couldn't see anything on the sheet about the energy rating/eco credentials of any new builds? It is important to think about this from the onset and incorporate energy saving features . Renewable energy savers such as solar panels.

Too many cars on green land chorlton and streford cant sustain the current amount of traffic. I like on north ryebank culde sac this proposition appals to me

What are the options for expanding the school grounds???

- 1) Housing should be REASONABLY priced private rented and shared ownership with some social housing.
- 2) Having lived in hulme before its redevelopment i feel it is essential for personal safety that all pedestrians and cycle routes are also routes for cars etc.
- 3) Consideration should also be given to the wild life that is curruntly inhaniting the space and needs to be able to travel freely between gardens and any open ground.

Congestion on Longford road is already a major problem. On road parking creates a single lane access along this long street which is used as a cut through by traffic from streatford avoiding chorlton. This traffic meets school traffic on a discretionary one way system flowing towards the park this is already a problem and will only be compounded by increased traffic in to the development. Cars to these houses must be taken away via Ryabank. There is residents or cyclist on longford road already. These new large houses will each add at least two cars to an already congested roads.

It is unacceptable to plan for this inevitability where is the social housing provision in all f the development along with visitor parking to the homes. Schools in the area are already over crowded