

CITY OF MANCHESTER
UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

REPORT INTO OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED ALTERATIONS
TO THE UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
(Oct/Dec 1998 and June/July 1999)

Inspector: Mr B Roberts BA MRTPI

Date: August 2000

10 August 2000

K Reed Esq
Director
Environment & Development
Manchester City Council
P O Box 463
MANCHESTER
M60 3NY

Dear Sir

Report on Objections to Proposed Alterations to Manchester Unitary Development Plan

1. I was appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions to consider objections made by written representation to Proposed Alterations 3, 6, 7, and 10 to the Manchester Unitary Development Plan. Proposed Alterations 3, 6, and 7 were placed on deposit for the making of objections and representations, with six other Proposed Alterations for a six week period ending 10 December 1998. Consequent upon objections received, Pre-Inquiry Changes were made to Proposed Alterations 3, 6, and 7. These were similarly placed on deposit, together with a new alteration - Proposed Alteration 10, for a six week period ending 27 July 1999.
2. A total of 12 duly made objections were received, 11 to the four Proposed Alterations 3, 6, 7, and 10, and 1 to the Pre-Inquiry Change to Proposed Alteration 6. I have set out in the accompanying report my Conclusions and Recommendations in respect of these objections. I have attached the List of Objectors and Objections, and the Core Document List as prepared by your Authority to which I have added your 'Response to Objections' report indexed as MCC 18. I made an unaccompanied site visit to Manchester Airport on 3 August 2000.
3. My report is enclosed.

Yours faithfully



B Roberts
(Inspector)

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Introduction	1
Alt 3 - Guide to Development in Manchester	2
Alt 6 - Special Needs and Supported Housing	3
Alt 7 - Large Buildings of Historic /Architectural Interest in Extensive Grounds	4
Alt 10 - Policies E 2.1 and EW 21	6
 Appendices	
Appendix 1 - List of Objectors and Objections	
Appendix 2 - List of Core Documents	

INTRODUCTION

1.0 The Manchester Unitary Development Plan (UDP) was adopted in July 1995. Following a report on the review process in April 1996, the City Council decided to prepare partial alterations to the Plan as and when appropriate rather than undertake a comprehensive review.

1.1 The Manchester Plan First Monitoring Report was published in October 1997 and identified a number of review issues. Consultation was undertaken on review issues, which were publicised in the 4th edition of City Planning News. Following consideration of responses to consultation, the City Council decided to put forward 9 alterations to the UDP. These were advertised and put on deposit for the making of objections and representations for a period of six weeks ending 10 December 1998. Eight duly made objections were made to Alterations 3, 6 and 7. The other alterations were adopted.

1.2 Pre-Inquiry Changes were prepared by the City Council in response to objections to the three alterations. These were advertised and put on deposit for a period of six weeks ending on the 27 July 1999. One duly made objection was received.

1.3 Alterations were also prepared by the City Council to Policies E 2.1 and EW 21 in order to clarify the policy framework in respect of the Green Belt at Manchester Airport. These alterations - ALT 10 - were advertised and placed on deposit for a six week period ending 27 July 1999. Four duly made objections were received to these alterations.

1.4 In view of the limited number of issues and objections received, it was agreed that objections would be considered as Written Representations, and that a Public Local Inquiry would not be held. However, it was also agreed that the objections would be considered by an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions, who would decide on the merit of these objections and make recommendations on them to the City Council.

1.5 The following section deals with the objections in number order. I set down below a number of abbreviated references used in the report.

AOA - Airport Operational Area
DETR - Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions
GONW - Government Office for the North West
HBF - House Builders Federation
MDS - Major Developed Site
PPG - Planning Policy Guidance
UDP - Unitary Development Plan
The Council - Manchester City Council

entitled 'By Design', as a joint publication by the Department of Employment, Transport and the Regions (DETR) and the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE), offers practical advice to further implement the Government's commitment to good design, as set out in PPG 1.

2.4 I would recommend the Council to consider the guidance set down in Section 3 of 'By Design', particularly under the heading 'The Development Plan', and draft a new policy / policies that make(s) a meaningful contribution to planning decisions. Consideration should be given to the incorporation to elements of the Development Framework in the 'Guide' as a policy statement(s) in the UDP.

RECOMMENDATIONS

2.5 That Proposed Alteration ALT 3 (Oct/Dec 1998) and Proposed Alteration ALT 3 Pre-Inquiry Change (June/July 1999) be not included in the UDP.

That a new policy/policies be written in replacement, that incorporate(s) elements of the Development Framework in the document 'A Guide to Development in Manchester (1997)' for inclusion in the UDP.

That the supporting text to policy be amended accordingly.

ALT 6 - Special Needs and Supported Housing Development Control Policy 1 and Policy 2

2.6 **OBJECTION** by

Government Office for the North West (GONW)

Development Control Policy 1 and Policy 2 are worded as statements of the Council's objectives / intents. The phrase 'The Council will have regard to' is too imprecise for implementation and monitoring.

ALT 6 - Special Needs and Supported Housing Pre-Inquiry Change to Development Control Policy 1

2.7 **OBJECTION** by

The House Builders Federation (HBF)

Policy 1 may be construed as a requirement that all housing proposals should consider the provision of an element of special needs accommodation. The wording should revert back to that shown at deposit stage.

CONCLUSIONS

2.11 In response to the objection from GONW, the Council propose to change the third sentence of the policy preceding the criteria to read: 'Planning consent will only be granted if the application is acceptable in terms of:'. This change is agreed by GONW and satisfies their objection. Government policy guidance on Development Plans is set out in PPG 12. It emphasises that plans should be clear, succinct, relevant and easily understood. The policy proposed under ALT 7 fails these tests in that the buildings to which this policy relates are not identified in a written list that also sets down the particular interest and/or features of merit that warrant the listing. This lack of precision will result in uncertainty on implementation, and make the monitoring of the effectiveness of the policy difficult.

2.12 I also concur with the objector St Quentin, that certain of the criteria can be found in Policy H2.2 of the UDP. There is also a measure of disparity in the criteria in that criteria (i), (ii) and (iii) have an emphasis on retaining the building, criterion (iv) has an emphasis on retaining the green landscape and natural features of the site, and criteria (v), (vi), (vii) set out well established matters in the development control process. Criterion (viii) is repetitive of a possible policy under ALT 3 setting out the principles of the document 'A Guide to Development in Manchester'. It is unclear as to whether the policy is seeking to retain buildings of local interest, seeking to retain buildings in landscaped grounds, seeking to safeguard residential amenity, or seeking to retain local area character.

2.13 I conclude that the Council should seek to draw up a local list of large buildings of historic / architectural interest in extensive grounds, and give consideration to following policy wording 'The redevelopment of large buildings of local historic/architectural interest in extensive grounds will only be permitted where there is no loss to the visual character and amenity value of the site, and nor to the visual quality and interest of the local area.' I appreciate the problem of a shortage of local authority staff resources in drawing up local lists; some authorities can however draw on the knowledge of civic societies and local organisations. The Council must be aware of large buildings of historic /architectural interest and their grounds under threat from possible redevelopment in view of the need to formulate a specific policy. This knowledge could form the basis of a list in supplement to the policy, and can be added to as further information comes to light. Sites identified could also be shown on the Proposals Map.

RECOMMENDATIONS

2.14 That Proposed Alteration ALT 7 (Oct/Dec 1998) and Proposed Alteration ALT 7 Pre-Inquiry Change (June/July 1999) be not included in the UDP.
That consideration be given to the inclusion in the UDP of the following policy wording in replacement: 'The redevelopment of large buildings of local historic/architectural interest in extensive grounds will only be permitted where there is no loss to the visual character and amenity value of the site, nor to the visual quality and interest of the local area'.

.....

2.18 To the north-west of the Terminal 2 Building, I would conclude that the boundary of the MDS should follow Thornley Lane and Runger Lane (a well treed/landscaped boundary significant to the safeguarding of the visual amenities of the Green Belt - Policy E 2.1 refers) south to the roundabout junction with the A538 Wilmslow Road. It will be noted that the AOA boundary north of Terminal 2 through Policy EW 8 land and adjoining Painswick Park is not well defined on the ground.

2.19 Further to the east at Moss Nook, on the basis of existing land uses, it would be preferable for the MDS boundary to follow the railway line, and not follow the AOA boundary along Ringway Road and Tedder Drive. I also noted on my site visit that there is land west of Woodhouse Lane outside the Green Belt in airport car parking use as an extension of this use within the Green Belt. The Green Belt boundary here is poorly defined on the ground. For the MDS to be well defined, a small adjustment to the Green Belt boundary is desirable so that it follows a clearly defined boundary on the ground and so makes easier the implementation of Policy EW 21.

2.20 Policy EW 21 as drafted by the Council in Document MCC 12 is for the most part satisfactorily worded. The Policy wording in Appendix 1 to the Council's Response Document MCC 18 is unsatisfactory as it relates to both the AOA and the MDS. As stated, the AOA is not all within the Green Belt to which Policy E 2.1 relates. The proviso in Policy E 2.1 referring to 'development necessary to enhance the economic vitality of the Region' is referred to in MCC 18, third paragraph, as relating to development 'in line with the list of uses set out in Policy EW 21'. The Council consider this proviso to be a tightening of control over development proposals outside the scope of the strict criteria of Annex C of PPG 2. I endorse this stricter approach and recommend that this point be added to Policy EW 21. A recommended rewording of Policy EW 21 is set down below.

2.21 I consider that the four paragraphs deleted from the Reasons in Policy E 2.1 should with minor editing be inserted in the Reasons that follow Policy EW 21. I also propose to recommend that the wording of the Reason to Policy EW 21 as set down in Appendix 1 of document MCC 18 (not MCC 12) shall be incorporated as part of the Proposed Alteration, particularly as sub-clause (h) deals with the matter of staff car parking raised in the objection by Macclesfield Borough Council. However in the first sentence of the Reason the words 'Airport Operational Area' should be changed to 'Major Developed Site' for consistency with Policy EW 21. Sub-paragraph (i) should be deleted as it refers to the 'Operational Area' and also gives no specific guidance. It is unnecessary to make reference to the application of both Policies E 2.1 and EW 21 as a statement within the policy. It is an operational matter best placed in the Reason.

RECOMMENDATIONS

2.22 That Policy E 2.1 be written as follows as a Proposed Alteration to be included in the UDP :

"Policy E 2.1

Within the Green Belt as defined on the Proposals Map, planning permission will not be granted, except in very special circumstances for the construction of new buildings for purposes other than agriculture, forestry, essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - List of Objectors and Objections

Appendix 2 - List of Core Documents

CORE DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED ALTERATIONS TO THE MANCHESTER UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

MCC1	The Manchester Plan, The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester adopted July 1995 (see separate box)
MCC2	Committee Report, April 1996, on the Publication and Review of the Manchester Plan
MCC3	The Manchester Plan First Monitoring Report, October 1997
MCC4	Committee Report, December 1997, on the Review of the Manchester Plan
MCC5	City Planning News, Issue 4, May 1998 - Consultation on the Review of the Manchester Plan
MCC6	Committee Report, September 1998, on Response to City Planning News and Proposed Initial Alterations to the Manchester Plan
MCC7	Notice of Deposit of Alterations to the Manchester Plan, ALT1 to ALT9, deposit period ending 10 December 1998
MCC8	Notice of Adoption of Alterations to the Manchester Plan in respect of ALT1,2,4,5,8 and 9, January 1999
MCC9	Committee Report, February 1999, on Objections to the Proposed Alterations to the Manchester Plan.
MCC10	Notice of Deposit of Pre-Inquiry Changes in respect of ALT3, 6, and 7, deposit period ending 27 July 1999
MCC11	Committee Report, November 1998, on Alterations to the Manchester Plan Policies E2.1 and EW21
MCC12	Notice of Deposit of Proposed Alterations to the Manchester Plan, ALT10, deposit period ending 27 July 1999
MCC13	Committee Report, March 2000, on Objections to Alterations to the Manchester Plan
MCC14	A Guide to Development in Manchester, January 1997
MCC15	Manchester City Council Response to Written Representation from Manchester Civic Society Regarding ALT3, June 2000
MCC16	Manchester City Council Response to Written Representation from Manchester Civic Society Regarding ALT7, June 2000
MCC17	Manchester City Council Response to Written Representation from Manchester Civic Society Regarding ALT10, June 2000
MCC18	Manchester City Council Response to Objections to Proposed Alterations