

Background Documents

Planning Policy Statements 1,9, 25
Planning Policy Guidance numbers 2,13,17,24
Regional Spatial Strategy for the Northwest of England to 2021
Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester policy numbers H2.2, E1.4, E1.5, E2.1,E2.4,E2.7,E3.5,L1.2,L1.4,T2.6,T3.7, BM13, DC26.4.
Manchester City Council - Open Spaces, Sport & Recreation Study adopted October 2009
Manchester Playing Pitch Strategy 2004
A Strategic Regeneration Framework for North Manchester
Heaton Park Historic Landscape Survey and Restoration Masterplan

Responses of:

Head of Engineering Services
English Heritage
Head of Leisure Services
Sport England
Barn Owl Conservation Network
Head of Environmental Health (Pollution & Contaminated Land Sections)
Environment Agency
Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive
Greater Manchester Police
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
United Utilities Asset Protection,
Ramblers Association
Ivan Lewis MP
Lancashire Gardens Trust
The Heaton Park Trust
Friends of Heaton Park
Environment and Operations Technical Services
Bury Metropolitan Borough Council
The three local Councillors for the Holyrood Ward of Bury MBC
The Football Association

Third Party Consultations:

Flat 1, Flat 2, 323 Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1PY
Flat 1, Flat 2, Flat 3, 327 Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1PY
Flat 1, Flat 2, Flat 3, 325 Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1PY
Prestwich Preparatory School, Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1PZ
1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11 Heaton Lodge, Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1NZ
349, 357, 359,361,361a, 363 363a, 367 351, 369 373, 377, 379, 383, 375, 381,
385b, 387 387a, 389 391a, 393 395 397 399a, 399 401 401a, 404, 408, 410, 411
412, 414, 415 417 419 421 423 416, 418, 418a, 420, 422, Bury Old Road,
Manchester, M25 1PY
Enigma Hair, 353 Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1PY
Tarn West, 355 Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1PY
5, 7, 8, 9 ,10, 11, 12, 14, 16, St. Margarets Close, Manchester, M25 2LY

1,3,5, 7 Roseland Drive, Manchester, M25 2GX
1, 3, 5, 7, 4, 11, 13,15, 17, 17a, 17b, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, St. Margarets Road, Manchester, M25 2GT
Reservoir House, St. Margarets Road, Manchester, M25 2GT
329, 331, 339, 335, 337, 333 Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1PY
Milton Place, 341, 343, 345, Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1PY
Temple Design Publishing Solutions Ltd, 371 Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1QA
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 ,8 ,9 Carver Avenue, Manchester, M25 1GA
Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1PZ
A V Jacobs & S Lazarus, Dental Surgery, 406 Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1PZ
1, 2, Park Place, Manchester, M25 1QZ
15a, 17 19 21 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 Polefield Road, Manchester, M25 2QA
Church House, St. Margarets Road, Manchester, M25 2QB
1, 1a, 1b, 2, 3, 4, 6, St. Margarets Close, Manchester, M25 2LY
St. Margaret`s Community Centre, St. Margarets Road, Manchester, M25 2QB
2 4 6,11, 15, Holyrood Close, Manchester, M25 1QD
C D C, 403 Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1PS
Global Investment Group Plc, 407-409, Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1PS
Global Investment Group Plc, 413 Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1PS
Post Office, Holyrood Post Office, 426 Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1PR
St. Margarets Road, Manchester, M25 2QB
The Royal Bank Of Scotland Plc, 424 Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1PR
11 St. Margarets Road, Manchester, M25 2QB
The Old Curiosity Shop, 391 Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1PS
Suka Take Away, 391 Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1PS
St. Margarets, Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1QA
Estelles Florist, 385 Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1QA
St. Margarets News, 365 Bury Old Road, Manchester, M25 1QA

Wards affected

Higher Blackley Ward

Implications for:

Anti-poverty	Equal Opportunities	Environment	Employment
No	Yes	Yes	No

Introduction

1. The application site is approximately 3.4 hectares in size and lies in the north western corner of Heaton Park adjacent to the existing bowling greens and Pavilion within the Higher Blackley ward of North Manchester. Heaton Park is a Grade II listed park on the Register of Parks and Gardens of special historic interest compiled and maintained by English Heritage. Heaton Park also lies within the Greater Manchester Green Belt. The Park forms the setting for a number of listed buildings including the Grade I listed Heaton Hall which lies approximately 800 metres to the east of the application site. The closest listed building to the application site is approximately 200 metres to the south (Rose Cottage, Grade II).

2. The application site is a predominantly open grassed amenity area with some currently used as an informal recreational area although there are some remnants suggesting previous play facilities on part of the site. The site is bordered by significant wooded areas and beyond these to the west are the substantial significant variations in its topography at its southern end. The application site is brick boundary walls of the park with residential and ecclesiastical properties beyond.

3. Entrance to this part of the Park for vehicles and pedestrians is via the St Margaret's Lodge entrance. Pedestrians can also gain access via a footpath to the south of the application site via Bury Old Road, a variety of other internal Park footpaths from the east and south also lead to the application site. Heaton Park Metrolink stop on Bury Old Road is approximately 10 minutes walk to the south. Two areas of unmarked car parking are situated to the north and south east of the application site and are all accessed via the St Margaret's Lodge entrance.

4. The St Margaret's Lodge entrance and boundary wall of the Park in this location forms the constituency boundary between Manchester City Council and Bury Metropolitan Borough Council administrative areas.

Description

5. The application is for the provision of 13 number small sided football pitches; 6 number tennis/netball courts; climbing wall; an extreme football cage; boundary treatments; associated car parking, landscaping and associated floodlighting. In connection with these facilities the application also includes the provision of a detached Pavilion building incorporating changing rooms and ancillary facilities including a store room, multi use rooms and café bar area.

6. The provision of these facilities will involve the re-grading, raising and levelling of the existing grassed amenity area to enable the provision of the artificial turf pitches, courts, Pavilion building and areas of hard landscaping. The most significant changes in existing and proposed site levels lie in the southern area of the application site where the most pronounced changes in topography occur. The most extreme changes in proposed levels will result in an approximate 1.8 metre overall rise above existing ground levels. From these proposed levels the land would be regraded from the southern edge of the proposed pitches down to existing site levels towards a public footpath to the south.

7. The proposal will involve the removal of a number of trees on the woodland edge to the north and west of the site and a group of trees to the south of the existing bowling greens. The proposed development also includes additional tree planting with 83 semi mature and heavy standard trees proposed to be planted in line with Heaton Park's Management Plan.

8. Due to the nature and use of the proposal, the eastern boundary and parts of the northern and southern boundaries are edged by a 2.3 metre high solid timber acoustic fence. Set behind this is the fencing around the tennis/netball courts and football pitches which comprises – a 1.2 metre high rebound board in front of a 2-3 metre high weld mesh fence and black netting on top to provide a maximum height of 5 metres. The remainder of the site is to be secured by a 2 metre high weld mesh

fence similar in style and colour (green) to that in place around the existing bowling greens. Further amendments to overcome security issues have resulted in additional 2 metre high fencing proposed in two areas; the first leading north from the access road and adjacent to the existing car park; and the second to the west from the edge of the proposed pavilion to the boundary wall of the Park. Access into the proposed sports facilities will only be through the Pavilion building and reception area within it, whilst the existing weld mesh fencing around the bowling greens and adjacent to the application site is proposed to be reduced in height to 1.5 metres.

9. All the proposed football pitches will be floodlit, the lighting columns will be 7 metres in height and the applicant has provided information relating to levels and areas of light spillage. This information suggests that the pitch lighting system is deemed suitable for national parks and areas of outstanding natural beauty and is designed to prevent horizontal light spillage and contains vertical spillage of light to within 2 metres of the pitch boundaries. The applicant's agent has confirmed that following comments from Environmental Health officers the proposed external pitches will be open from 9am to 10pm Monday to Sundays, it has also been confirmed that the wider Park will continue to close at dusk. A vehicle access gate is proposed on the main access road slightly beyond the entrances to the proposed and existing car parking areas.

10. The application incorporates the provision of a 38 space car park (including 8 spaces for disabled people) to the front of the application site with access from the main Park access road leading to St Margaret's Road. The car park area also includes areas for cycle parking and a storage area for bins. The applicant has also indicated that following agreement with Manchester Leisure, the existing car park to the north of the application site will be formally marked out to provide an additional 129 car parking spaces (including 17 spaces for disabled people). This area of existing car parking is, and will continue to be used by those visiting the park and not just the proposed development.

11. The proposed Pavilion building provides 4 changing areas with separate shower facilities and 1 disabled changing room. The Pavilion also includes:

- A lounge, a servery/office/reception and kitchen area serving the lounge and an adjacent foyer area which will also accommodate a facility for vending machines.
- A store area, external store, cleaners store and plant area.
- Staff room and 2 multiuse rooms.

12. The applicant has confirmed that the café area is provided as an ancillary and supporting element of the overall facility and will not be open to members of the general public.

13. The Pavilion building is single storey and at its highest point will be 4.75 metres in height. The pavilion will be of steel frame construction over clad with timber cladding, the cladding will be finished in a timber preservative; the colours to each element of the structure will differ from black to the lounge area and a medium brown to the changing areas. There will be a glazed lobby entrance linking the two halves of the building together. Glazing is also concentrated on the elevation overlooking the pitches to maximise viewing visibility from the lounge area towards the pitches.

14. Manchester Leisure Services have confirmed that the applicant is their chosen development partner and that the new facility will be managed on a day-to-day basis by Goals plc. The intention is that a joint management committee will be formed, comprising Manchester City Council Leisure Services (Manchester Leisure) and Goals plc. Manchester Leisure indicate they are confident that this combination of experience from the public and private sectors will result in an efficiently run, safe and secure facility which will provide high class sports provision for the local communities, schools and sports groups.

15. Members are advised that the City Council has an interest as land owner and are a development partner in the proposal. However, Committee must disregard these interests and discharge its duty as local planning authority only.

Consultations

16. The application has been advertised as one affecting a Listed Building, Major Development and Departure from the Development Plan by way of notice in the Manchester Evening News, site notice and notification letters to neighbours and statutory consultees. The scheme has been subject to a number of revisions since it was originally submitted, resulting in re-notification of those amendments to neighbours and other consultees. On all of these occasions further site notices were posted around the site and further advertisements were placed in the Manchester Evening News. The application and revisions to it have generated a significant number of letters, emails, petitions and comments left on the City Councils Public Access System. The following section of this report summarises the responses received.

17. Ivan Lewis MP (Bury South) – A letter of objection to the planning application has been received. The reasons for objection are:

- Traffic
 - Existing car parking provision at the St Margaret's entrance to the park is inadequate.
 - Park visitors are frequently parking in the neighbouring residential area and increasingly the gates are shut as a consequence of all car parks being full.
 - The proposed new development will make this situation considerably worse and have a seriously detrimental impact on the quality of life of local residents.
- Noise
 - The proposed opening times of the new development including a bar will significantly increase noise, particularly late into the evening; once again this will have a detrimental impact on the quality of life of residents.
- Environment
 - Concerned at the effect of the proposed development on wild life, trees, and a significant proportion of the park's green space.

18. Mr Lewis has also requested that Planning Committee undertake a site visit prior to making a decision on the application.

19. The objection letter also requested a copy of any deed of covenant, which exists in relation to Heaton Park. A copy of the title and plan showing the extent of the Council's freehold ownership were forwarded to Mr Lewis by the City Solicitor.

20. Local residents – In total 1432 letters of objection have been received, a significant proportion of these have been similar letters. In addition 5 petitions against the proposal have been submitted containing 845 names; 338 objections to the proposal have been left on the City Council's public access system; 62 emailed representations have been submitted. In summary the grounds of objection relate to:

- Increase in noise pollution in the area and the impact of this on residents and the enjoyment of their homes.
- Increase in light pollution from the proposed floodlights.
- Air pollution as a result of increased traffic accessing the park.
- Loss of public access to this part of Heaton Park.
- Great scheme, but it is in the wrong location a brownfield site should be used instead.
- Increase in traffic congestion as a result of the proposal
- Impact of the proposal on green belt and the fact that Heaton Park is on part of an extensive area of open land that prevents the merging together of Whitefield, Prestwich, Middleton and North Manchester.
- The proposal does not accord with Manchester City Councils Unitary Development Plan policies H2.2, E3.5, L1.4, BM13, or E2.1.
- Loss of historic parkland and the proposed development would lead to unacceptable changes to the character of the Park.
- The applicant has not properly applied for all the uses contained in the Pavilion building as shown on the submitted drawings.
- The development will result in damage to the existing ecology of the site.
- There is the potential for an increase in anti-social behaviour as a result of the development.
- Proposal will undermine the integrity of Heaton Park which should be safeguarded for future generations.
- There are opportunities to improve the existing football pitches elsewhere in the Park.
- Impact of the proposal on Bats, which are shown as foraging in the area.
- A different access point to the park should be used.
- There is already an existing problem with cars parking outside of the park on neighbouring roads this will be exacerbated by the proposal particularly by those refusing to pay for car parking in the Park.
- The car park proposed is inadequate.
- There is already little green space in the city.
- Proposed pitches are too close to residential properties.
- The proposals should be located elsewhere in the Park such as off Sheepfoot Lane.
- Concern about the impact of the proposal on St Margaret's Church and services held there.
- Negative effects of the proposal will be felt most by residents of Bury who live next to the park rather than residents of Manchester.
- Affect of the proposal on value of residents houses.
- There are restrictive covenants on the use of the Park.

- There are already sufficient sports type facilities in Prestwich, Whitefield and the surrounding areas.
- If this goes ahead it will be the beginning of the demise of the park, because bit by bit Manchester City Council will go on selling bits of the Park to commercial companies until at the end of the day we end up with a couple of fields.
- The proposal will lead to road safety issues in the area.
- A brownfield site elsewhere should be used for this facility.
- Do not understand why it is necessary to despoil a beautiful park area in order to place ugly sports facilities (in which only a minority are interested), simply for the profit of a large private organisation and its executives. Why has Heaton Hall not been restored instead?
- The application site is very popular with local residents as it is the only easily accessible grassed area near the St Margaret's Road entrance. It is enjoyed by dog walkers, families with young children and has been enjoyed by generations of local families and it is a disgrace that the proposed destruction of this green and pleasant land is primarily for financial gain. The next comparable area is the main body of the park, past the hall and beyond reasonable walking distance for many of the present users.
- Concerned about the integrity and security of the wider Park with proposal being open until 11 pm.
- Why put a facility for the benefit of Manchester resident's right at the northern boundary of Manchester. Would it not have been better to put it in a more central Manchester position?
- The proposed development will destroy the Ecology/ Wildlife, Plants and trees. A number of objectors stated that a wide variety of birds and other wildlife are found in this area of the Park, which will be impacted upon by the proposed development.
- The proposed fencing around the development makes it look like a prison compound.
- There is already a sports development within 200 metres of the Grand Lodge entrance which is available to all at low cost.
- The Park is of national importance recognised by English Heritage and is a big tourist attraction the proposed facility will detract from the vistas as people arrive through the St Margaret's entrance.
- The proposal is inappropriate development in the green belt and does not fall within the description of "small changing rooms or unobtrusive spectator accommodation for outdoor sport" as stated in PPG2 and would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt.
- The submitted Bat survey identifies sightings of Bats along the perimeter of the proposed development site, the development will significantly disrupt their habitat and cause disturbance to them. Two of the bat sightings are shown on some of the trees specifically earmarked to be removed.
- The development will result in the loss of trees on the site and because the development is intended to be built close to existing trees there is a high likelihood of damage to existing trees.
- Impact of the proposal and associated lighting on the activities of the Community Astronomy Group that currently use the adjacent bowls pavilion.
- The proposed fencing and acoustic fence will be obtrusive.
- Impact of the proposal on the tranquillity and enjoyment of residential property.

- Other sports facilities in local High Schools are currently underused;
- The proposal involves the removal of an existing car parking area used by visitors to the Horticultural centre, bowling greens and existing football pitches.

In addition an email has been received from an objector that raises issues around the validity and level of detail and assessment contained within the submitted noise report, matters relating to noise and the assessment provided are considered elsewhere in this report.

21. Reverend Plummer the parish priest of St Margaret's Church has submitted objections to the application and specifically:

- The impact on the ecology of the proposal on the application site and wider area including bats and wild birds.
- Noise impact of the proposal, its associated activities and traffic generation on adjacent residential properties, and the activities and services of the Church.
- The inadequate level of car parking and congestion associated with the proposal.
- There are other local facilities in the area that are not used to their capacity.

22. A letter has been received from the Save Heaton Park Committee detailing matters they feel have not been adequately addressed in relation to the Bat Surveys and the impact of the proposal on Bat activity recorded at the site. The points they raise are:

- The developer has submitted a lighting report, which provides that the lighting level reduces to 5 – 10 lux within 10 metres of the pitches. 5 – 10 lux is the level of ambient lighting typical in urban areas.
- The report does not however set out whether this is the lowest level of spill which is achievable, nor does it demonstrate that any account has been taken of the need to reduce spill levels as far as possible to protect the bats.
- The Planning Statement indicates that it is still proposed that the development would operate until 11pm in winter, and although it is proposed that half the pitches would be lit beginning on the half hour and half beginning on the hour, it is clear that the intention is to light all of the football pitches at once. Again the findings of the bat survey are not made.
- The UDP policy E2.4 is not wholly in line with national policy in that it does not go so far as requiring planning permission to be refused if significant harm cannot be prevented. This is because the unitary development plan was prepared in 1995 before the relevant PPS was adopted. As the national policy is the later document, it should be preferred. Accordingly, development should not be permitted if significant harm to wildlife interests cannot be adequately mitigated or compensated.
- A recent court decision called R (on the application of Simon Woolley) (Claimant) v Cheshire East Borough Council (Defendant) & Millenium Estates Ltd (Interested Party) (2009) confirms that planning authorities must have regard to the provisions of European and domestic legislation on wildlife and biodiversity.
- It is not considered that the developers have currently dealt properly with mitigation of harm. Although shielding mechanisms are going to be used to limit the amount of light spillage beyond the pitches themselves, there is still going to be spillage of above 5 -10 lux within 10 metres of pitches, and of

- around 5 – 10 lux beyond that. It is known that levels of light as low as 0.06 lux can have a negative impact on bats.
- There is no mention of limiting the hours of lighting, or of lighting only some of the pitches in order to attempt to mitigate the harm. The developers say that without the ability to light the site until 11pm in the winter the development will not be economically viable. It therefore seems that it is not possible to adequately mitigate the damage which might be caused by the floodlighting. Nor does it seem possible for compensation for the damage caused to be provided because any compensation would have to be creation of an equivalent area of unlit open space within the vicinity, which is unlikely to be possible. It is believed that the development should not be permitted due to the impact that it will have on European Protected Species.
 - There is no precedent for lighting of the type proposed here. It is precisely because the park is dark that the bats are present there and therefore to introduce lighting, even if predominately only at ambient urban night time levels is a big change in the environment at this location.
 - Illuminating a bat roost creates disturbance and may cause desertion of the site. Light falling on a roost access point may delay bats from emerging and reduce their subsequent foraging time.
 - Lighting is considered to be particularly harmful if used near woodland edges, ponds and along river corridors and hedgerows used by bats.
 - Artificial lighting disrupts the normal light patterns of night and day and may as a result, affect the natural behaviour of bats. Bats may move away from lit areas and some areas of continuous lighting may create a barrier that some species will not cross. This may affect social interaction.
 - The findings of sections 4.2, 4.9 and 4.10 of the Bat Survey are agreed with. As the proposed site for the planning application is surrounded by woodland inhabited by bats we feel these statements in themselves are reason enough to reject this planning application.
 - The report has not discounted the possibility that bats could roost in these particular trees. The report seems to be inconsistent on the roosting potential of the trees earmarked for felling. In points 8.2 trees earmarked for felling have no roosting potential for bats and in point 9.1 states the trees earmarked for felling have a very low roosting potential. Which are contradictory statements. By saying very low roosting potential the report does not rule out the possibility that there maybe bats roosting in these trees, which is completely different from saying there is no roosting potential for bats.
 - The report seems to ignore that fact that there will still be large number of intact trees surrounding this proposed development that provide roosts for bats. They will be seriously affected by 3.4 hectares of parkland being floodlit at night. Not to mention the large amount of human activity as people are engaged in playing sports on the outdoor pitches.
 - This planning application should be rejected due to the impact that it will have on European Protected Species.

23. The matters raised by Save Heaton Park Committee relating to Bats are considered in more detail within the Ecology section of this report.

24. Environment Agency – Following receipt of a revised Flood Risk Assessment the Environment Agency removed their previous objection to the proposals and

request that any approval includes a condition relating to the implementation of a surface water drainage system based on the sustainable drainage principles contained within the revised Flood Risk Assessment.

25. Manchester City Council Arboricultural Officer – Has no objection to the development in terms of its impact on the existing tree cover. He recommends that all work in the vicinity of trees should observe the British Standard 5837: Trees in relation to construction.

26. English Heritage – Have sent substantial comments on the application and subsequent revisions to the application. The initial response of English Heritage raised a number of significant issues, which the applicant has sought to address in the submissions of revisions. The comments to the originally submitted scheme stated:

27. “English Heritage acknowledge that these proposals are within an area designated as a ‘sports zone’ in the Heaton Park Restoration Masterplan (HPRMP). However, despite the developer’s acknowledging that this is a, “*high quality landscape with a distinct visual character*”, there is poor understanding of the national significance of this historic designed landscape and the implications for accommodating such facilities within the registered park”.

28. English Heritage are concerned that the intensity of development proposed within this open space will have a detrimental impact upon the character of this section of the park. They suggest amendments are sought to moderate the impact of the proposal to ensure that the structures and infrastructure are able to be more appropriately accommodated within the park.

29. In their response English Heritage confirm they were not consulted prior to the application being submitted by the developers and, therefore, have not made any comment on the proposed development to date, despite the inaccurate quotes in the submission documents.

30. The key issues for consideration by English Heritage are the impact on the setting of the highly graded listed buildings and the character and fabric of the registered parkland. These are discussed below.

Impact on the setting of Heaton Hall and the Listed Building Group.

31. The location of the ‘sports zone’ in the HPRMP was determined on the basis of minimising the impact on the setting of the main listed building group which are effectively screened by the woodland. English Heritage state that despite the proposal being a substantial development within the park’s boundaries, the visual impact on the setting of the historic building group is moderated by substantial landscape features. They believe the main impact of the development is on the open character of this component space within the park which they consider to be substantial and is detailed below.

Impact on the character of the registered historic park.

32. The applicant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment under-plays the magnitude and significance of the development's effects. This is based on an assessment of the relative importance and value of this part of the designed landscape which English Heritage do not share.

33. English Heritage concur with the developer's assertion that Heaton Park is a "*high quality landscape*", however they consider that it is the individual quality of the component spaces which establish the overall park character, and their erosion consequently has a potentially substantial impact.

34. English Heritage states that the submitted Design & Access Statement fails to adequately address the impact on the registered historic landscape as a design consideration; and, to acknowledge the relevance of PPG15 to the development. As a consequence they are concerned that the "*Concept Design Development*" is flawed as it fails to consider the actual impact of the development on the key material issue (i.e the character of the park).

35. English Heritage do not have any criticism of the focus on a contemporary architectural solutions for the Pavilion building, but they emphasise that the applicants have failed to demonstrate exactly how this particular development "*sits well in this context*" as they do not consider the collective impact of the structures on the park.

36. English Heritage believe that whilst the surrounding area is clearly urban, the actual site is designated as both Green Belt and part of the historic park/pleasure grounds and therefore by definition *not-urban*. They believe greater weight should have been given in the design evolution to the extent to which the development retains the openness and parkland character of this part of the green belt/historic landscape.

37. They believe that the proposed site plans fail to clearly describe the extent of the enclosure of the space by the fencing and to appropriately assess the impact on the either the character of the park or the Green Belt location. The applicant has subsequently provided additional visualisations of the proposed boundary treatments and fencing.

38. English Heritage do not consider that the application addresses the local policy requirement to demonstrate how the proposal, is "*compatible with the special character of the Park*" (UDP policies L1.4 & BM13).

39. English Heritage emphasise that it is important to understand that this historic designed landscape comprises a series of interconnecting open spaces. Some of these provide the setting for particular historic features (such as the Hall or the Temple) others are simply parkland, featuring trees as single specimens, as clumps or woodland belts. These parkland spaces have their own intrinsic character and value which should be analysed and understood as part of the design process, to determine the most appropriate scale and character of any new development for the respective space. This approach holds true irrespective of the relative values of the different spaces within the Park and despite the designation of the application site as a "sports zone" it is not a blank canvas.

40. English Heritage believe that although the existing space is largely self contained it is important as a linking space between the entrance drive, walled garden and Glade, and the footpath access from Bury Old Road. The Drive from St Margaret's Lodge is no longer merely the service entrance but now (following relocation of the main car park to the north of the Hall) provides the principal access to the Park. As such it is English Heritage consider it imperative that the parkland setting for this drive is retained and, where possible, enhanced to provide an appropriate sense of arrival. They consider that the new multi-sports facilities, particularly the new car park, will further erode the historic character of this approach and therefore the design should be re-considered.

41. With any new development proposed within a designated landscape, as a minimum, English Heritage would expect the quality of all new design to be of a high standard and demonstrate a balanced relationship with the existing landscape. In this instance English Heritage do not believe the balance to be appropriate and they do not consider that sufficient value has been attached to the value of the open space within which the development will be located.

42. English Heritage confirm they have no, in principle, objection to the development of the sports facilities, but are of the opinion that the proposed scale and the extent of physical and visual barriers (in the forms of fencing and hedging) will effectively annexe this area of parkland and thereby detract from special character of the designed landscape. This visual impact also impacts on the amenity of the park use in the creation of the rather constrained and meanly proportioned perimeter footpaths running as straight lines, hemmed in by fencing, hedging and tree belts. This will be far removed from the relaxed access which the current space retains, despite the presence of the bowls pavilion and its associated greens.

43. English Heritage is of the view that the proposed development fails to sit comfortably within the registered historic landscape and has failed to appropriately assess the full impact of the proposed sports development on the park. As a result the intensity of the development would have a dominating impact which will detract from the special character of the park. They therefore, suggest that significant amendments are made to moderate and mitigate the impact of the development on the park.

44. English Heritage confirmed that they did not support the development in its current form and recommend the following amendments:

- a) Removal of the proposed new car park (retaining spaces for those with mobility problems), modifications to the shape of the existing car park north of the Drive and white line marking to create a more efficient use of space. This might be mitigated by extension of the existing car park into the grass space immediately to the west, while retaining most of the existing trees which divide the two areas.
- b) Reduction in the numbers of pitches and courts to retain a more fluid space around the new complex, with more relaxed and open footpath links.
- c) Removal of the boundary hedges and separating hedge around the bowling green to maintain more permeability in views across the site and connectivity with the surrounding park.

d) Pulling back the projecting entrance gate and perimeter fence to the Bowls area, away from the Drive to create a more open and uncluttered space along the Drive frontage.

e) Retention of the mound and birch trees within the Skate park to increase potential for skate boarding and retain as a viewing point, northwards across the Park to the Pennines.

45. Following discussions between the applicant, the local planning authority and English Heritage, revisions to the application were submitted. English Heritage have made the following comments to those revisions:

46. English Heritage confirm that the proposal has been moderated, but they believe it remains a substantial intervention into the park.

47. They acknowledge that the amendments have addressed their suggestions made in previous correspondence. In particular, the removal of the outer fencing will help relieve the oppressive impact of the development by opening up the footpath edge, re-instating an area for use as grassland (or potentially additional screen tree planting).

48. They comment on the principle of the accommodation of sports facilities within the park being appropriate, particularly in a 'sports zone'. They state that the impact of such development must be balanced against a variety of factors, including the desirability to preserve or enhance the historic landscape. In this instance they believe it should include the retention of the openness of this part of the parkland.

49. English Heritage comment that it is now evident that the combination of the solid 2.3 metre high acoustic fencing, the framework of the 5 metre high fencing, the change in levels and the relocated Pavilion will disrupt views across the parkland and create a tightly enclosed compound within the park's boundary. While the amendments have addressed some important issues, English Heritage consider that the revelation of the full impact of the fencing rather reinforces their view that the proposed development will erode the character and appearance of the historic landscape and fail to preserve the openness of this part of the green belt.

50. They retain the opinion that the proposed scale, and the extent of physical and visual barriers (primarily in the form of essential fencing) will effectively annexe this area of parkland and detract from the special character of the designed landscape. English Heritage remain of the view that the development will have a negative impact on the character of the parkland.

51. Manchester Conservation Area and Historic Buildings Panel – The panel understood the concept of the Sports Zone and the logic in promoting a facility in this relatively isolated area of the park, however they considered the proposal to be intensive and not sufficiently informed by the surrounding landscape. The majority of panel members supported the principle but objected to the intensity a minority felt that due to the proposal a derelict site would be more appropriate than a historic park and garden.

52. The panel were concerned with the layout of the pitches in relation to the Pavilion building and that existing levels could be used to create banks to assimilate the facility into its setting. The panel were concerned with the proposed skate park next to the bowling green. The skate park has been subsequently removed from the application.

53. The panel believed the aspiration should be for a world class building and landscape but this could only be achieved with a less intensive proposal that responded to the character of the historic parkland rather than the imposition of a standard solution.

54. Heaton Park Trust – The Trust was set up jointly by English Heritage, Manchester City Council and the Heritage Lottery Fund 14 years ago as part of the process of public scrutiny and involvement in the restoration and funding for the Park. It is a publicly elected body made up of City of Manchester residents, who are there to represent the Park users of the city. There is also one elected representative from those areas, not within the city boundaries, but that abut the Park, as well as one representative of each of the specific user groups, though the latter representatives have restricted voting rights. Local City of Manchester councillors are also in attendance and take part in debates but do not vote.

55. In their response the Trust state that the applicant presented the scheme to them prior to a formal planning application submission. Following that presentation the Trust were satisfied that the proposed development would satisfy the original proposals envisaged within the plans for the restoration and development phases drawn up by Manchester City Council 15 years ago. The proposal was voted on by the Trust and was overwhelmingly passed that they would support the scheme.

56. Following examination of the original submission and the revised plans they fully accept and endorse these as both an acceptable and desirable addition to the existing facilities within Heaton Park.

57. The Trust notes that the off peak free use of the facilities is particularly welcome as is the income that will be generated, some of which will be directed to Manchester Council Leisure services. Apart from these reasons, they are also happy that yet another area of the park will come back into full utilisation to its maximum potential, other than its present sad usage as a dog walkers latrine and will increase the visitor numbers to this regional attraction.

58. The Heaton Park Trust fully backs Goals UK Ltd and Manchester City Council in developing what promises to be a series of first class sports and leisure facilities, which will benefit Manchester residents of all ages. This will also bring yet another attraction to Heaton Park, while fulfilling yet another promised phase of its continued development.

59. The Trust are mindful of the great efforts of Goals UK Ltd to consult and explain their plans, in detail, both to the Trust and other Park user groups, as well their technical expertise in sensitively planning to make this sports area as unobtrusive as possible to those few local residents who live in the vicinity.

60. They are also pleased that the existing strikingly modern Bowling Pavillion, built for the Commonwealth Games , will have an equally high quality and well designed Changing Room/Cafe-Bar building to compliment it and the Sporting facilities, in that area. They have no issue with the planned car parking arrangements which again, seem to have been well thought out.

61. The Trust gives its full support to these plans, which they hope will get the approval that they thoroughly deserve.

62. Lancashire Gardens Trust – The siting of this intensive sports development is totally at odds with the aims of the Heaton Park Restoration Masterplan. The views will be of fencing, lighting columns, a climbing wall and cars. Lancashire Gardens Trust urge Manchester City Council to reject this plan, and re-locate this sports complex away from Manchester's only high-quality Georgian and Regency designed landscape.

63. Greater Manchester Police (Design for Security) – The original proposal was considered to be adequate in relation to security. The submission of additional information relating to site security and management and the addition of further security fencing the proposal is also considered to be acceptable in relation to security matters.

64. Head of Leisure Services – States that the Masterplan for the restoration of Heaton Park developed in consultation with the local communities, English Heritage and the Heritage Lottery Fund and approved by the City Council in 1997 formed the foundation for the restoration of Heaton Park's historic landscape and listed buildings together with the improvement of its public facilities. The Masterplan identified an area in the north west corner of the Park for the creation of a Sport Zone that has traditionally been used for sporting activity, a site considered by English Heritage to be outside the historic core of the park where the provision of much needed new facilities in this area would not intrude on the restored landscape around Heaton Hall. The Commonwealth Games Bowls complex built in 2001 was the first part of the delivery of the Sport Zone and the proposed new facility with its dedicated car park will sit alongside these bowling greens taking up just 3.4 of Heaton Park's 260 hectares.

65. The construction of the facility, along with its subsequent operation and upkeep, will be funded entirely by our chosen development partner, Goals Plc. The partnership with Goals plc will maintenance and development of the Park to the highest standards. The new facility will be managed on a day to day basis by Goals plc who are recognised as one of the industry leaders in this area of leisure provision. However, we also intend to create a joint management committee, comprising of Manchester City Council Leisure Services and Goals plc and we are confident that this combination of experience from the public and private sectors will result in an efficiently run, safe and secure facility which will provide high class sports provision for the local communities, schools and sports groups.

66. During the early stages of the development of the proposals consultation with various organisations took place. Talks were held with the Head Teacher of St Monica's High School, the closest school to the proposed development, who

confirmed full support for the proposals as the facilities will provide a valuable resource for the school which will be able to use them under an arrangement whereby during off peak times use of the pitches and courts will be free to community groups. The Heaton Park Trust, the body that represents the Park's user groups and voluntary organisations confirmed its support for the proposals, and consultation also took place with the neighbouring Bury MBC who were at that time in support of the objectives of the scheme.

The strategic fit of the development

67. Manchester's Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study has defined the site covered by the proposed development as a City Park and has identified a quantitative surplus of City Park open space across the North Manchester area, when set against the agreed local standard for provision.

68. The study has also identified key issues for the North area of the City. These issues include the shortfall of outdoor sports facilities in North Manchester, with gaps identified in the provision of synthetic turf facilities, tennis courts and bowling greens. Also the quality of the open space in North Manchester is below average and the poorest in Manchester. In particular natural and semi natural open space and young people's facilities are particularly poor. However the quality of open spaces, sport and recreation facilities is very uneven with some areas such as Heaton Park providing a high quality Green Flag award winning environment.

69. The Manchester Playing Pitch Strategy key findings for the north area of the city are that current provision of outdoor sports pitches was adequate to meet current levels of demand. However the poor quality of the pitches has significant impact on their capacity, which significantly affects the development of sporting clubs and their opportunities to develop further. Some clubs and teams will migrate to other areas as they cannot access pitches of adequate quality. The Strategy also found that there was a shortfall of mini soccer pitches and based on current levels of demand and no junior pitches available to meet unmet/potential demand.

70. In summary the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study findings would support the development of high quality outdoor sports and young people's facilities in this part of the City, on an area of open space that is currently showing a quantitative surplus. The Playing Pitch Strategy underpins these findings demonstrating that provision of high quality facilities will help meet unmet/potential demand.

71. Head of Regulatory and Enforcement Services (Environmental Health) –

Recommend that a number of conditions be attached to any approval relating to: the provision of those recommendations set out in the Acoustic Report (Section 5.1) and acoustic fence location in accordance with the submitted drawings; a standard condition in relation to the submission of scheme for the acoustic insulation of any externally mounted ancillary plant, equipment and servicing; hours of use restrictions on the use of the external areas of Monday to Sunday of 9am to 10pm; a condition relating to the design and installation of the lighting scheme to control glare and overspill onto nearby residential properties.

72. Head of Regulatory and Enforcement Services (Contaminated Land section)

73. Historical information relating to this site indicates the possible presence of significant levels of contamination. It is therefore recommended that a contaminated land condition should be attached to any approval.

74. Head of Highway Services – No objections to the proposals.

75. Sport England – Have no objections to the proposal. They recognise that the redevelopment of this part of Heaton Park as a Sports Zone has been identified through a number of strategies. They conclude that the proposed accords with Sport England's exception policy E5 which states "The proposed development is for an indoor or outdoor sports facility, the provision of which would be of sufficient benefit to the development of sport as to outweigh the detriment caused by the loss of the playing field or playing fields. They request conditions are attached to any approval relating to the specification and construction of the proposed multi use games areas; scheme for the final layout of the proposed skate park and climbing wall; a scheme for the phasing and management of construction works at the site to ensure that access to and availability of the adjacent bowling greens and pavilion is maintained during the construction period.

76. Bury Metropolitan Borough Council – Bury MBCs Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment published in January 2009 identifies the Prestwich area as having a significant deficiency in outdoor sports provision. This assessment also noted that the playing pitch quality in the area was of average standard. They conclude that the proposal will have significant benefits for Prestwich and will help remedy identified shortfalls in provision. Bury MBC raise no objection to the proposal, subject to the following conditions:

- Condition requiring the illumination of the pitches to be turned off after 2200hrs each night in order to protect the residential amenities of the properties adjacent.
- Condition required ensuring that mitigation measures are in place prior to the facility becoming operational as the scheme has inadequate peak period parking provision and in order to protect the amenities of the residents on the access road to the development.
- Condition requiring full noise mitigation measures to be in place prior to the bringing into use the proposed facilities in order to protect the residential amenities of the nearby properties.

77. In a follow up response Bury MBC confirmed they had no objections subject to full consideration of matters relating to parking, noise and the hours of illumination. It was also requested that the proposal re-introduced the skatepark removed in revisions to the scheme. This response also requested further publicity for the application specifically for the residents of Prestwich. They suggested a public meeting to be held so the views and opinions of those most affected by the proposal could be heard first hand by either the City Council or the developer prior to making a recommendation on the application.

78. The applicant has undertaken consultation on the application prior to its submission, this is outlined within its Consultation report submitted alongside the application. The local planning authority is also satisfied that the requisite notifications for statutory consultees, neighbours and residents predominantly of Prestwich; and advertisements in the local press and site notices advising of the

application have been undertaken in accordance with statutory obligations. In this instance the local planning authority does not consider there to have been a need for a separate public meeting.

79. Local Councillors for the Holyrood ward of Bury MBC – Object to the planning application. They state that they have been contacted by many local residents 95% of whom are against the proposals. They believe the proposal will have a significant negative impact on the quality of life of the Prestwich area which surrounds the site. They believe that this site is an inappropriate setting for a Soccer Centre of this size and nature.

80. In terms of traffic for the Soccer centre all access is through the St Margaret's Road entrance. They state it is an unclassified road which has an un-signalled junction onto Bury Old Road. Since the St Margaret's Road entrance has become one of the two main vehicular entrances to the Park the road has witnessed significant congestion at peak periods. There is a constant stream of traffic accessing the park already which quickly and easily becomes unacceptable congestion on a warm weekend or school holiday or evening.

81. They support the aspirations of Manchester Council to restore Heaton Hall as a major regional heritage attraction. They are however, concerned that this application does not "look forward" to a time when this has hopefully happened, and St Margaret's Road will also have to be used as the vehicular entrance for this attraction.

82. St Margaret's Road serves a number of residential areas and a number of important community facilities including St Margaret's Church, two church owned halls/community centres which are in regular use. They do not believe that St Margaret's Road is a suitable road to cope with the additional traffic.

83. The scheme provides for 41 parking places which they assume would be free to use for those using the soccer or other sports facilities. Additional pay to use parking is also available inside Heaton Park – though these are closed when the Park closes and are normally full on a busy weekend day and would not therefore be available for use by Soccer Centre users.

84. The applicant notes that 90 parking spaces would be needed at peak hours 1800 -1900 hrs.

85. At present all the roads around the St Margaret's Road suffer from excessive non-residential parking as people take advantage of the free on-street parking to avoid having to pay in Heaton Park.

86. On a busy warm weekend or school holiday day or evening, they state that parking on all the streets around the St Margaret's entrance can be hugely problematic. Cars make the roads "single carriage" and difficult to navigate, cars park on pavements causing danger and nuisance to pedestrians.

87. They believe that the Soccer Centre will make matters significantly worse. People will clearly use the free parking available in the scheme, but after this, are likely to

park on nearby roads. Given the scale of the existing problem without the Soccer Centre, they believe this will quickly spread across Bury Old Road into Heys Road, Merton Road, Orange Hill Road etc. They believe that the existing community facilities will be adversely affected by the lack of available parking, as will the small businesses on St Margaret's Road and Bury Old Road.

88. Obviously some of the users of the Soccer Centre will arrive by public transport – mainly by Metrolink at Heaton Park station. They do not believe this would be the main mode of transport to the Soccer Centre, particularly on dark evenings.

89. The councillors do not believe that adequate parking has been included within the scheme, and that this will have an adverse affect on the residential, community and business properties around St Margaret's entrance.

90. A Soccer centre by its nature creates more noise and light than an empty piece of parkland.

91. The site of the Soccer Centre neighbours directly onto residential and community facilities (the houses on Park Place, Bury Old Road, Carver Avenue and St Margaret's Road, and the Church on St Margaret's Road). They note that the site is to be floodlit for evening use until 1100 pm every night. For most of the year this will mean all evening.

92. A clubhouse facility is proposed in the site plan. In other sites run by Goals Soccer Centres, they believe functions and other social events seem to be an important additional commercial activity, and there is no suggestion that this will be any different at this site.

93. The light created by the floodlights, and the noise created by people using the sports facility, the club house and people arriving and leaving by car will significantly alter the nature of this quiet residential area to the significant detriment of local residents.

94. The proposed development will remove from public use a piece of open parkland, with a significant loss of amenity for local residents and visitors alike, and on the wildlife and trees in this part of the Park.

95. Heaton Park is a popular park used by many people for many different purposes:

- Heaton Park is a major sub-regional attraction and a destination for people from Manchester and the wider Greater Manchester.
- For the North Manchester and Prestwich residents who live around the park, Heaton Park is the local park where people walk, walk their dogs, children play etc.

96. The proposed development will remove from free public use the North West corner of Heaton Park. At present this is a peaceful but locally popular corner of the park which is easily accessed on foot from the St Margaret's Road entrance and from the pedestrian entrance on Bury Old Road. Although there are other open Parkland areas in Heaton Park they aren't for some way. Immediately beyond the proposed development site is the reservoir, then the horticultural centre, then the free football

pitches on Bury Old Road – it is quite a walk to get to the next free and open part of Heaton Park.

97. This piece of land is currently used by children's groups (e.g Brownies) from the St Margaret's Road community facilities for outdoor activities and by the children from the preparatory school on Bury Old Road. They question where these outdoor activities will take place if this development is built.

98. The site proposed will mean the felling of a number of well established trees and will also affect the habitat of bats that live in this part of the Park. The applicants study suggests that the bats will not be adversely affected by a floodlit Soccer Centre – the Councillors do not agree with this.

99. Local residents have been told about the "free community" use that it is suggested will form part of the programme of the Soccer Centre – to a certain extent this raises more questions than it answers. When they contacted a Goals Centre in Sheffield to book a free community session, they were told that all the "free community use" was taken up by a local secondary school.

100. They believe that the construction of a Soccer Centre in this part of Heaton Park will remove for ever a peaceful piece of open parkland. Local people will have lost use of their local parkland. They believe that the natural environment will be significantly affected by the development.

101. The Councillors very much welcome the development of sports facilities, including commercially run sports facilities, however they strongly feel that this is the wrong place for the facility. They state that they have been heavily involved over a number of years in successfully lobbying for new sports facilities just around the corner at Parrenthorn High School and they also note the new Soccer Centre at Philips High School about 1 mile up the road towards Whitefield.

102. They hope that the local authorities could work with the developers to find alternative venues in North Manchester and/or Bury.

103. United Utilities (Asset Protection) – Have no objections to the proposal provided the site is drained on a separate system, with only foul drainage connected into the foul sewer. Surface water should discharge to the soakaway/watercourse/surface water sewer and may require the consent of the Environment Agency. If surface water is allowed to be discharged to the public surface water sewage system we may require the flow to be attenuated to a maximum discharge rate determined by United Utilities. UU would not want to see any net increase in surface water run off from impervious areas draining from this site. Foul drains must have adequate grease traps. All surface water drains must have adequate oil interceptors.

104. It is the developers responsibility to provide adequate land drainage without recourse to the use of the public sewer system.

105. The connection of Highway drainage from the proposed development to the public wastewater network will not be permitted.

106. Provided access to the water mains is unrestricted, for maintenance purposes, as outlined in the conditions for easements document, there are no objections.

107. Ramblers Association – Object to the application. They believe the facilities will be situated in what is at present a fairly quiet part of the park, use by the public for informal recreation. It is valuable to local people for this purpose, being quickly accessible by the footpath leading to it from a point next to the school on the Bury Old Road. For those pedestrians entering the park via the entrance on St Margaret's Road, near St Margaret's Lodge, the extra traffic generated will make conditions very difficult and unpleasant. Although floodlighting will be designed to minimise light pollution and that special fencing will be installed to reduce noise levels, there will inevitably be an adverse effect on the tranquillity of the park for some distance around the facilities. So not only will the area actually covered by the facilities be lost to the public, but also the "countryside feel" of the park will be lost over a wider area.

108. Greater Manchester Ecology Unit – Initially requested further Bat survey work to be undertaken between June and August to determine the level of bat activity across the site, and that a non-technical summary of the lighting reports be provided. Following receipt of further Bat Survey reports and light spillage drawings from the applicant they conclude that the level of light spillage affecting the most likely bat foraging habitat (the woodland to the south west and the north east) will not be so high as to cause significant disturbance to feeding pipistrelles. The lighting will not be in operation throughout the night and will likely be limited to certain parts of the development. They therefore do not object to the lighting planned for the development on the grounds of impact on bats.

109. Manchester City Council Travel Change Team – The submitted Framework Travel Plan is acceptable subject to the provision of details relating to secure cycle storage, a contact for the Travel Plan Co-ordinator and date of when the development is to be complete. A condition relating to the cycle storage is to be attached to any approval as well as the submission of a full Travel Plan for the proposal within three months of the development being operational.

110. Football Association – Support the application which will offer benefits for local football in terms of providing a first-class facility for increased access, enabling playing opportunities for a wide section of the local community and also enhance changing room provision for users of the adjacent grass-pitches. They fully support the application which will enhance our programmes within the Manchester area and contribute to raising participation levels within the Manchester County FA Development Strategy.

Feedback from applicants pre-application consultation

111. The applicant has included information relating to the extent of consultation they undertook prior to the submission of the current planning application and the general response they received and responses to them in the scheme submitted in the planning application. The consultation included a public exhibition on two separate days (Tuesday 24th March 2009, 3.30-7.30pm and Saturday 28th March 2009, 10am – 2pm) at the Farm Centre in Heaton Park; one day included an evening session, whilst the other day was on a weekend, both being run to allow those working regular

hours to visit the exhibition if they wanted to do so. The exhibition was publicised prior to the event through advertisements in the local newspapers (Bury Times, Bury Journal, Radcliffe Times and Prestwich Advertiser), a press release, via letters to stakeholders and a letter-drop through the doors of residents living adjacent to the park.

112. The general responses received that have been supplied by the applicant were:

- We think it will be a good use of space in part of park currently underused. We live locally and think the local community will benefit from these facilities.
- Seems sympathetically planned to blend in to the surroundings. Good that tennis facilities are planned.
- This is a very good plan; well thought-out and fully supported by us at DRH School of Coaching. Look forward to using and enjoying this in Heaton Park.
- A positive development for the park.
- It is a good facility. Well planned and useful for the community.
- The amount of parking spaces seems inadequate.
- Very worried about the traffic.
- Why not locate the scheme on the Middleton Road side of the park?
- I am sure the land on Sheepfoot Lane would lend itself more to your plans.
- Primary concern is traffic and pollution which this project would escalate on St Margaret's Road.
- I have some reservations about access/traffic to St Margaret's Road and St Margaret's Close.
- We have concerns about the additional traffic that would be using St Margaret's Road.
- The noise from people playing football will affect local residents, especially as it is due to be open late.
- As residents of St Margaret's Road, we have concerns about the noise pollution that this development would bring.
- You will have to consider the security of the rest of the park.
- I am concerned that people not using the facilities will have access to the remainder of the park at all times.
- The lights will be shining right in our back yard.
- Fences and AstroTurf are not an improvement over a large green space for casual sports and dog walking.
- A small weight-training and running machines facility would fit well with this idea.
- The size is not necessary. A four-pitch system is viable. Also the pricing and costs are not entirely feasible given the socioeconomic situation of the very close estates.
- My concern about the development is the loss of a flat grassed area used by youngsters for cricket and rounders.
- I am concerned that it will remain open until 11pm

Environmental Assessment Screening

113. The application was subject to a screening opinion in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 and circular 2/99 (The regulations). The screening concluded that an Environmental Assessment was not required in this instance.

Relevant Planning Policies

PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'

114. This document sets out the overarching planning policies on the delivery of sustainable development through the planning system.

115. Planning should facilitate and promote sustainable and inclusive patterns of urban and rural development. The statement indicates that regeneration of the built environment alone cannot deal with poverty, inequality and social exclusion and that these issues can only be addressed through better integration of all strategies and programmes, partnership working and effective community involvement.

116. Integration with other strategies and programmes is considered elsewhere in this report but the proposal is considered to generally accord with PPS1.

PPG 2 'Greenbelt'

117. The document provides guidance on development within the Green Belt. The policy guidance on green belts is restrictive in nature for both the redevelopment of redundant/underused buildings as well as for wholly new development. The main characteristic of a green belt designation is its permanence with the most important attribute being its openness.

118. There is a general presumption against inappropriate development within the green belt, and any inappropriate development should only be approved in very special circumstances. It is for the applicant to show why development should be granted permission. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

119. The construction of new buildings in the green belt is inappropriate development unless the building is genuinely required for the purpose of providing essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation.

120. The making of a material change in the use of land is inappropriate development unless the change maintains the openness of the green belt and does not conflict with the purpose of including the land in the green belt.

121. Full consideration of the proposal in the context of PPG2 is detailed elsewhere in the report.

PPS 9 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation'

122. **PPS 9** sets out planning policies on protection of biodiversity and geological conservation through the planning system.

123. The statement sets out the key principles that local planning authorities should adhere to ensure that the potential impacts of planning decisions on biodiversity and geological conservation are fully considered.

124. The applicant has submitted an ecology report and Bat survey report with the application and these matters are discussed in more detail elsewhere in the report.

PPG13 'Transport'

125. The objectives of this guidance are to integrate planning and transport at the national, regional, strategic and local level to:

- promote more sustainable transport choices for both people and for moving freight;
- promote accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling, and
- reduce the need to travel, especially by car.

126. The applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment with the application and these matters are discussed in more detail elsewhere in the report.

PPG15

127. This PPG provides a full statement of Government policies for the identification and protection of historic buildings, conservation areas, and other elements of the historic environment. It explains the role played by the planning system in their protection.

128. It also sets out that local planning authorities considering applications for planning permission or listed building consent for works, which affect the setting of a listed building are required by law to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of the building. It also states that the effect of proposed development on a registered park or garden or its setting is a material consideration in the determination of a planning application.

129. The applicant has submitted a Landscape and Visual assessment with the application and these matters are discussed in more detail elsewhere in the report.

PPG17 'Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation'

130. This document outlines how the planning system can help deliver: accessible, high quality and sustainable open spaces and sport and recreation facilities which meet local needs and prevent the erosion of such facilities from insensitive development or the incremental loss of sites. In considering planning applications - either within or adjoining open space, Local Authorities should weigh any benefits being offered to the community against the loss of open space that will occur.

131. Planning permission should be granted in Green Belts for proposals to establish or to modernise essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation where the openness of the Green Belt is maintained. Development should be the minimum necessary and nonessential facilities (eg additional function rooms or indoor leisure) should be treated as inappropriate development. Very special circumstances which outweigh the harm to the Green Belt will need to be demonstrated if such inappropriate development is to be permitted.

132. The applicant has submitted a Needs assessment with the application and these matters are discussed in more detail elsewhere in the report.

PPG 24 'Planning and Noise'

133. This PPG gives guidance to local authorities in England on the use of their planning powers to minimise the adverse impact of noise. It outlines the considerations to be taken into account in determining planning applications both for noise-sensitive developments and for those activities, which will generate noise.

134. The applicant has submitted a Noise Assessment report with the application and this matter is discussed in more detail elsewhere in this report.

PPS 25 'Flood Risk'

135. This guidance looks at how flood risk should be considered at all stages of the planning and development process. It details the importance of the management and reduction of flood risk in planning, acting on a precautionary basis and taking account of climate change.

136. The Environment Agency's (EA's) flood zone maps indicate that the site is in Flood Zone 1 (see Appendix B) and, therefore, has a low probability of flooding from fluvial sources (i.e. there is less than a 0.1% annual probability of flooding). However, because the application site exceeds 1 hectare in size the application is required by PPS25 to be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment. The FRA has also investigated the potential of flooding from the Heaton Park reservoir which concludes "in the very unlikely case of a breach of the reservoir embankment, it is not anticipated that this development will significantly increase the risk to public health because of the general topography of the area (as discussed in Section 3.2) encouraging water to flow towards the existing outlet watercourse and away from this local high point".

137. The site is located in an area with a low probability of flooding and following the guidance in PPS25 can be considered appropriate for development.

138. Surface water will be disposed to ground through the use of reinfiltration methods such as permeable paving or cellular storage soakaway with suitable attenuation to control the risk of temporary surface water flooding. The Environment Agency have confirmed that the revised FRA is acceptable subject to a condition relating to the implementation of a surface water drainage scheme based on sustainable drainage principles.

Northwest of England Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021

139. In terms of regional policy, the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West was adopted in September 2008. The Regional Spatial Strategy forms part of the statutory development plan for every Local Authority in the North West and provides a framework for development and investment over the next fifteen to twenty years. The following policies are considered relevant:

140. Policy DP 3 states sustainable economic growth should be supported and promoted, and so should reductions of economic, environmental, education, health and other social inequalities between different parts of the North West, within the sub-regions, and at local level.

141. Policy DP4 states that development should build upon existing concentrations of activities and existing infrastructure.

142. Policy L1 states that plans, strategies, proposals and schemes should ensure that there is provision for all members of the community for sport, recreation and cultural facilities..

143. Policy RT9 Requires local authorities to ensure that proposals and schemes for new development incorporate high quality pedestrian and cycle facilities.

144. The proposal would accord with the aspirations outlined in these policies.

Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester

Part 1 Policies

145. Policy H2.2 states the Council will not allow development which will have an unacceptable impact on residential areas. The matters which the Council will consider in coming to such decisions will include the scale and appearance of the development and its impact in terms of noise, vibration, traffic generation, road safety and air pollution

146. Policy E1.4 states the Council will control noise levels by:-
- ensuring that new development involving high noise levels is not permitted where it would be likely to cause a nuisance to occupiers of nearby properties;

147. Policy E2.1 advises that within the Green Belt as defined on the Proposals Map, planning permission will not be granted for development unless very special circumstances exist or unless the development is:

- the construction of new buildings for agriculture and forestry, essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, for cemeteries, and for other uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of including land in it.

148. In all instances the Council will ensure that the visual amenities of the Green Belt are not injured by proposals for development within or conspicuous from the Green Belt, which, although they would not prejudice its main purpose, might be inappropriate by reason of their siting, materials or design.

149. Policy E2.4 states the Council will ensure that the effects upon wildlife are taken fully into account when considering development proposals.

150. Policy E2.7 advises that the Council wishes to ensure that buildings and areas of special architectural or historic interest are retained, maintained and, where necessary, restored. It will seek to preserve and enhance the setting of such

buildings and areas by appropriate control over the design of new development in their vicinity, control over the use of adjacent land and, where appropriate, by the preservation of trees and landscape features.

151. Policy E3.5 states the Council will promote measures, which will lead to a safer environment for all people living in and using the City. These measures will include:-

- a) ensuring that the layout of new development is designed with safety in mind and does not lead to the creation of isolated areas;
- b) designing landscaping schemes so as to minimise the risk of attack;
- c) that community facilities are located where they are easy and safe to get to;
- d) providing safe places for children to play;

152. Policy L1.2 states existing outdoor sporting facilities and recreational areas will be protected from development unless appropriate replacement facilities can be provided in advance or it can be shown that adequate facilities exist within the local area. Opportunities will be taken to improve the range and quality of facilities, especially in inner areas of the city. The provision of all-weather pitches will be encouraged as a means to both extend and improve the quality of provision so long as this is consistent with the protection of residential amenity. New facilities should be located where they can be easily served by public transport.

153. Policy L1.4 advises that the Council will work with the private sector to provide a greater range of recreational activities in Heaton and Wythenshawe Parks in ways which do not detract from the character of these parks and their value as major open spaces for informal recreation. The application will extend the amount of formal recreational facilities within Heaton Park, matters relating to the proposals impact on the character of the park and informal recreation are considered in more detail elsewhere in this report.

154. Policy T2.6 states the Council will expect adequate car parking provision to be made for disabled people so that they can get easy access both to existing and new facilities in the City. The application includes the provision of 8 disabled person car parking spaces within the site and additional provision on the existing Park car parking area. It is considered that the proposal accords with this policy.

155. Policy T3.7 states the Council will encourage the provision of secure cycle parking facilities especially in the City Centre, local centres, bus and railway stations and park and ride facilities, major areas of employment and close to recreational and Leisure facilities and educational establishments. The Council will expect major new developments to make adequate provision for secure cycle parking. The application includes the provision for secure cycle parking facilities and is considered to accord with this policy.

Part 2 policies

156. The application site is located within the Blackley, Charlestown and Moston area of part 2 of the UDP. Heaton Park is identified as being wholly within the Greater Manchester Green Belt and is also identified as a leisure and recreational improvement area on the UDP proposals map.

157. Policy BM1 a) states in deciding its attitude to proposals within Blackley, Charlestown and Moston, the Council will have regard to the general policies in Part 1 of the Plan in order to protect and improve the quality of the formal and informal open space.

158. Policy BM13 states the Council proposes to provide for an increased range of recreation and leisure-based activities at Heaton Park in a manner which is compatible with the special character of the park and which respects the amenity of adjoining residential communities. In particular, any scheme must:-

- take account of Policy E2.1 which relates to development in the Green Belt;
- preserve and enhance the architectural integrity and educational and cultural value of Heaton Hall and its associated features, including the historic character of the landscape.

159. Policy DC26.4 advises that where the Council believes that an existing noise source might result in an adverse impact upon a proposed new development, or where a new proposal might generate potentially unacceptable levels of noise, it will in either case require the applicant to provide an assessment of the likely impact and of the measures he proposes to deal satisfactorily with it. Such measures might include the following:

- engineering solutions, including reduction of noise at source, improving sound insulation of sensitive buildings or screening by purpose-built barriers;
- layout solutions, including consideration of the distance between the source of the noise and the buildings or land affected by it; and screening by natural barriers or other buildings or non-critical rooms within a building; and
- administrative steps, including limiting the operating times of the noise source, restricting activities allowed on the site or specifying an acceptable noise limit. Any or all of these factors will be considered appropriate for inclusion in conditions on any planning permission.

North Manchester Strategic Regeneration Framework (NMSRF)

160. The NMSRF defines the strategic context for the regeneration of North Manchester. It establishes key principles and objectives across the range of inter-related social, economic and physical issues affecting the area.

161. It identifies Heaton Park as a strategic investment opportunity where investment can facilitate major progress and that it is one of North Manchester's greatest under-utilised assets.

Issues

Green Belt

162. As already noted, Heaton Park is located within the Greater Manchester Green Belt and is identified as such within the adopted Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (UDP).

163. National Green Belt policy is long established and is set out within Planning Policy Guidance note 2 (PPG2). In addition policy E2.1 within the UDP is also

concerned with preserving the openness of the Green Belt and the Council will ensure that the visual amenities of the Green Belt are not injured by proposals for development within or conspicuous from the Green Belt which, although they would not prejudice its main purpose, might be inappropriate by reason of their siting, materials or design.

164. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. PPG2 states that inappropriate development is, by definition harmful to the Green Belt.

165. In considering the application the local planning authority has also taken into account the additional information supplied by the applicant in terms of the essential requirements of the proposal in order that it be economically viable, and a recent appeal decision concerning a similar scheme on Metropolitan Open Land which is protected from inappropriate development in the same way as Green Belt land. The applicant has also provided further information relating to the very special circumstances it believes exist if the development was considered by the local planning authority to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

166. In considering the application and the proposed uses regard has been made to guidance within PPG2 on the positive role the Green Belt has to play in providing opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas. The proposed outdoor recreational facilities, which include the small sided football pitches, extreme football cage, and climbing wall are all considered to be appropriate land uses within the Green Belt. The lighting, fencing and other structures associated with the proposed recreational facilities are all considered to be essential to the functioning of those uses and are, therefore, not considered to be inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

167. Additionally, the proposed Pavilion building has been sited close to existing belts of trees that reduce its visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The building has been designed to have a minimum floorspace (558 sqm net internal area) and will provide essential facilities' for the outdoor recreational facilities and wider public park and following careful consideration is considered, on balance, to meet the definition of an essential facility set out within PPG2.

Proposed site levels

168. The proposal will result in changes to existing ground levels. The proposed changes are greatest within a limited area within the southern section of the application site where the existing topograph results in a sudden fall in levels. Due to the proposed uses and the existence of substantial underground services related to the reservoir to the north of the application site, a rise in levels is proposed. In this southern area this amounts to a 1.8 metre increase from existing to proposed levels to bring it in line with the existing levels on the remainder of the site. The proposed site levels will affect views from the public footpath to the south of the application site and residential properties at Heaton Lodge, Bury Old Road. However, it is not considered that the overall affect of site level changes impacts on the openness of the green belt. Views across, in, and out of this part of the Park are and will continue

to be severely restricted by the surrounding areas of woodland and the embankment of the Heaton Park reservoir to the north of the application site.

169. The local planning authority has considered the impact of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt. It is accepted that the proposal will change the character of this part of the Park and site levels in certain limited areas of the application site. However, this part of the Park is enclosed by substantial areas of woodland and the embankment of the Heaton Park Reservoir to the north, which restrict views across, in, and out of the Park in this location. On this basis, and that the Pavilion element of the proposal has been positioned to further minimise the impact on openness, it is not considered that the overall proposal will conflict with the intentions of Green Belt policy or the purposes of including land within it as set out in PPG2.

Loss of Open space

170. A number of objectors have commented on the proposal resulting in the loss of a significant amount of local open space.

171. The proposal will result in this part of Heaton Park being closed to the general public and no longer available to those who are currently able to use it for informal recreation, walking etc.

172. In considering this particular issue regard has been made to the loss of Open space; the wider impact of the proposal in providing formal outdoor recreational facilities; and, the location of the proposal within a Public Park.

Manchester City Council Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study and the Manchester Playing Pitch Strategy

173. Manchester City Council has recently published its Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study. This study undertook an assessment of open spaces, sport and recreation facilities within the City Council boundaries in accordance with the requirements of Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (PPG17) and its Companion Guide published in September 2002. The study will form part of the evidence base for the Local Development Framework (LDF) and the development of the Core Strategy DPD, which will be the key spatial plan for Manchester.

174. Heaton Park has been audited within the study as a City Park. Overall within North Manchester the study identified a quantitative surplus of City Park open space when set against the agreed local standard for provision. The study identifies the key issues for the north area of the City as being a shortfall of outdoor sports facilities with particular gaps in the provision of synthetic turf facilities, tennis courts and bowling greens. In addition, the Manchester Playing Pitch Strategy identified poor quality of pitches in the north area of the City, a shortfall of mini soccer pitches, and based on the levels of demand no junior pitches available to meet unmet/potential demand.

175. In recognition of the responses received from residents of Prestwich and in considering the application, regard is also made to Bury MBC's response to the planning application and the conclusions of Bury MBC's Open Space, Sport and

Recreation Study. This study concludes that there are significant deficiencies in the Prestwich area of the Borough of outdoor sports provision.

176. In addition to the findings of these studies consideration is also made to the acceptability of this type of proposed use within a public park. Public parks generally encompass a range of uses for both informal and formal recreational activities. Heaton Park is no exception to this and provides the facilities for both residents of Manchester and surrounding Boroughs. Both the applicant and Manchester Leisure have identified the range of uses available within the Park and confirm that there will be significant parts of the Park still available for informal recreational purposes following the development of the proposed facility.

177. It should also be noted that the proposal incorporates the provision of tennis courts that are located to the western edge of the application site. The applicant and Manchester Leisure have confirmed that these facilities are replacement facilities for those previously located elsewhere in the Park. As part of the development of the Heaton Park Restoration Management Plan it was considered appropriate for these to be removed from the more historic core of the Park and re-provided to a more acceptable location. It has also been confirmed that the provision of the tennis courts fits with Manchester Leisure's aspirations to be recognised as a 'tennis hotspot' – a Lawn Tennis Association quality standard which requires the provision of such facilities within public parks.

178. The applicant has also indicated that a significant amount of free community use will be made available at the facility during the day for both Manchester and Bury local community groups and schools. It is considered appropriate to attach a condition to any approval relating to the provision of a Community Use scheme on the basis of the information already provided by the applicant and that 60% of the facilities opening time will be made available free of charge.

179. It is accepted that the proposal will result in the loss of open space available for informal recreational purposes. However, the conclusions of Manchester City Councils Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study would support a loss of open space against the additional provision of formal outdoor recreational pitches, which are identified as having a shortfall of provision in this area of North Manchester and the neighbouring area of Bury MBC (Prestwich). It is considered that there will remain significant opportunities for informal recreational activities within the Park after the proposed development and that a significant amount of the opening hours of the facility will be made available free for community use.

180. In this instance, the loss of informal open space is considered acceptable against: the community benefit the facility will provide through free community access; and, the identified deficiency of outdoor sports facilities identified in both Manchester and Bury MBC. The proposal therefore accords with PPG17 and L1.2 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan.

Ecology

181. The application has been accompanied by an Ecology report and the applicant has undertaken Bat Surveys of the site and its environs.

182. The EC Habitats Directive 1992 requires the UK to maintain a system of strict protection for protected species and their habitats. The Directive only allows disturbance, or deterioration or destruction of breeding sites or resting places in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment

and provided that there is

- no satisfactory alternative and
- no detriment to the maintenance of the species population at favourable conservation status in their natural range.

183. The UK implemented the Directive by introducing The Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994 which contain two layers of protection

- a requirement on local planning authorities to have regard to the Directives requirements above, and
- a licensing system administered by Natural England.

184. Policy E2.4 of the Unitary Development Plan states the Council will ensure that the effects upon wildlife are taken fully into account when considering development proposals.

185. Circular 6/2005 advises local planning authorities to give due weight to the presence of protected species on a development site to reflect EC requirements. "This may potentially justify a refusal of planning permission".

186. PPS9 (2005) advises local planning authorities to ensure that appropriate weight is attached to protected species "Where granting planning permission would result in significant harm (local planning authorities) will need to be satisfied that the development cannot reasonably be located on any alternative site that would result in less or no harm. In the absence of such alternatives (local planning authorities) should ensure that, before planning permission is granted, adequate mitigation measures are put in place. Where significant harm cannot be prevented or adequately mitigated against, or compensated for, then planning permission should be refused."

187. PPS9 encourages the use of planning conditions or obligations where appropriate and again advises local planning authorities to "refuse permission where harm to the species or their habitats would result unless the need for, and benefits of, the development clearly outweigh that harm."

188. The converse of this advice is that if issues of detriment to the species, satisfactory alternatives and public interest seem likely to be satisfied, no impediment to planning permission arises under the Directive and Regulations.

189. In this case the applicant's ecological survey identifies that there are no statutory internationally, nationally or locally designated areas within the site itself or within 1km of the site. Three Sites of Biological Interest (second tier non-statutory designated sites) were noted within 500m of the site, the closest of which is located

at the reservoir 120m north of the site. The development is not likely to impact on the SBIs.

190. Most of the site was found to comprise amenity grassland and scattered parkland/trees. These habitats are considered to be of low ecological value. A small area of marshy grassland is located in the western part of the site which also has limited ecological value.

191. Bluebell was noted in the south western part of the site. Bluebells are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) which makes it an offence to sell or offer for sale this species. As it is not an offence to remove them as part of the site clearance this is not likely to affect the proposed development.

192. No records of protected species were noted for the site. This was confirmed during the site walkover where no protected species or evidence of protected species was noted.

193. There is potential that the trees at the site can be used by nesting birds during the nesting season (February to August). As the development will require trees to be felled it is strongly recommended that this activity takes place outside of the nesting season and that all vegetation and felled trees are removed or chipped to prevent nesting birds using this material.

194. A further Bat Activity Survey was undertaken following the recommendations of the Ecology report. This survey noted whilst some of the trees viewed from the ground did have minor features that may offer some very limited potential for bat roosting the majority of the trees earmarked for felling were considered to have no roosting value for bats.

195. Bats were noted foraging and commuting around the site. Pipistrelles, common pipistrelles (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*) in particular, were noted around the woodland edges running alongside the existing Bowling-Green area, but also around the woodland near to St Margaret's Lodge and the driveway. A noctule was briefly encountered on the April visit but not recorded during the August visit. Pipistrelles and noctules are protected by the Habitats Directive.

196. The report concludes that the trees earmarked for felling on site were considered to have very low roosting potential for bats. Low key bat activity was present around the site, mainly in the form of pipistrelle activity with the very occasional noctule.

197. The loss of the trees currently designated for felling are unlikely to affect either roosting or foraging potential for bats.

198. Ideally work on likely bat trees should be carried out in the spring (late March, April, May) or the autumn (September, October, November). This avoids periods when bats are particularly vulnerable – during hibernation and when non-flying young are present. However, the bird nesting period needs to be avoided so early March period may be the only viable timing in this case.

199. The construction of soccer and other sports pitches will not affect bats to any great degree in terms of loss of roosting or foraging potential but the question of lighting the site and an increase in human activity may well have an effect on foraging bats.

200. In considering Ecology and protected species issues for the application site the local planning authority has consulted with its specialist ecologist advisors at the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit. They have also been asked to review the additional points made by the Save Heaton Park Committee.

201. They conclude from the lighting contours that the level of light spillage affecting the most likely bat foraging habitat (the woodland to the south west and the north east) will not be so high as to cause significant disturbance to feeding pipistrelles. In any case the lighting will not be in operation throughout the night and will likely be limited to certain parts of the development. On this basis the Ecology Unit do not object to the lighting planned for the development on the grounds of impact on bats.

202. It is of note that PPS9 makes reference to either 'significant impact' or 'significant disturbance'. The 1994 Regulations, which give effect to the European Habitats Directive, define "disturbance" as including disturbance which is likely to impair the ability to survive, breed, reproduce or migrate or significantly affect the local distribution or abundance lighting can detrimentally affect the roosting and foraging behaviour of bats. The lighting proposed at Heaton Park may affect bats, since it has been demonstrated by survey that bats do use the area, at least for foraging. However, in this case it is difficult to demonstrate that the disturbance that may be caused to bats would be significant enough to justify refusing the application on the grounds of disturbance to bats. This is due to:

- Light spillage from the floodlights will only significantly affect a relatively small area of good bat feeding habitat (the trees and woodland to the north east). There is abundant alternative foraging habitat in the Park (open water and trees and woodland) such that the potential loss of this small area of woodland cannot be considered significant.
- It is unlikely (from the results of survey) that any bat roosts will be directly affected by the lighting.
- The bat species most likely to be affected by the lighting is common pipistrelle. Pipistrelles are known to be relatively tolerant of low light levels (up to 16 lux). They often emerge from roosts at dusk or twilight before it is properly dark. The pipistrelle is the most common species of bat to be encountered in Manchester. They appear to be relatively tolerant of urban lighting levels. In urban and sub-urban areas pipistrelles rarely roost in trees, preferring to roost in buildings.
- The lighting will be limited in terms of the timing of operation, and will be directed at ground level. Bats tend to forage in the canopy levels of trees.

203. Taken together, these factors would indicate that it is unlikely that the proposed development will significantly affect bats to the extent that their local population status will be detrimentally affected. It is not considered that there are substantive grounds for refusing the application on the grounds of impact on bats. The attaching of certain conditions would further reduce the probability of the development affecting

bats; including that the lighting be fitted with directional hoods to target the lighting and reduce light spillage, and the lights are fitted with controls so that they are only illuminated when the pitches are occupied.

204. It is considered that the proposed development would have only a minor impact on foraging Bats and that there would be no appreciable effect on the conservation status of the local population as a whole. The applicant has confirmed that the pitches will only be used and therefore illuminated until 10pm. Conditions are also proposed to be attached to any approval relating to lights being switched off when pitches are not in use. It is considered that this will adequately mitigate the minor level of harm caused.

Traffic

205. A significant number of comments have been raised regarding the increase in traffic as a result of the development, the lack of car parking proposed and the impact this will have on the surrounding highway network, residents and visitors to facilities on St Margaret's Road.

206. The facility will be accessed via the access road into the Park from St Margaret's Road. Any impacts on the highway network will largely be within Bury MBC's administrative area. The applicant has indicated in their supporting information that pre-application discussions were held with the Highway departments of both Manchester City Council and Bury MBC. It is proposed to provide 38 spaces (including 8 disabled spaces) within a dedicated free to use car park for the proposed facility. The car park was reduced in size following comments from English Heritage. The revised proposal also indicates that the existing area of car parking which is for general Park use to the north of the application site is to be formally demarcated to provide 129 spaces. This area of existing car parking lies outside of the application site and will be available for both park users, as is currently the case, and users of the proposed facility.

207. In its response Bury MBC note that the submitted Transport Assessment indicates that the busiest peak hour traffic, between 2000 – 2100 on a weekday, should not present a problem in highway capacity terms as it is outside the busiest peak times on the surrounding road network.

208. Following revisions to the application and the intention to formally mark out the existing car park to the north of the application site Bury MBC have indicated that "whilst the submitted 'Proposed Site Plan' ref. 2006.1375.001 010 Rev P14 indicates that this car park is to be re-marked as part of the development proposals, if this existing car park that is located outside the planning application red-edge site is not available for this use, the development is likely to lead to vehicles parking on the surrounding highways in Bury. This would not be acceptable in highway safety terms and proposals to mitigate this should either be submitted as part of the current planning application or conditioned if planning permission is granted, in order to ensure appropriate measures are agreed prior to the commencement of the development and in place when it becomes operational."

209. In addition to the submitted Transport Assessment, the applicant has also submitted a framework Travel Plan and the development of a full Travel Plan will be made a condition of any approval.

210. It is noted that the application site is in a location that is relatively well served by public transport, Heaton Park Metrolink stop is located a 10-minute walk from the application site and Bury Old Road is well served by bus services.

211. It is considered that the proposed dedicated car parking area, alongside the formal marking out of the existing car parking area and the proposed management measures, to be dealt with by way of a planning condition, will result in an acceptable level of proposed car parking for the facility. It is considered that the proposal accords with policies T2.6 and T3.7 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

Noise

212. The applicant has submitted an Acoustic report with the application. A significant number of objections have been made regarding the impact the proposal will have on the surrounding residential area both in terms of noise from road traffic and activities associated with the proposed facility.

213. The submitted Acoustic report recommends a number of mitigation measures to reduce the noise impact of the proposed outdoor recreational facilities, these include:

- The rebound boards around the perimeter of each pitch should be of single height only; double height boarding should not be used.
- The rebound boards should be acoustically damped in order to reduce re-radiated noise when struck by the ball. This should be achieved by bracing the boards using horizontal rigid steel sections fixed tightly to the rear. All boards to the goal ends (i.e. the short ends) of the pitches should be braced with two evenly spaced horizontal steel bars. In general, boards along the pitch sides should be braced with a single centrally located horizontal steel bar. However, all boards oriented towards the nearest dwelling should be braced with two evenly spaced bars, as per those at the goal ends.
- The eastern and southern perimeters of the tennis courts should be provided with an acoustic screen in order to minimise the noise impact from the football pitches (and the tennis courts) at the nearest residential properties. It should have dimensions large enough to break the line-of-sight from the proposed football pitches to residential windows of the nearest dwellings. It is expected that the screen will need to be at least 2.3m high. The screen should be constructed from solid material with a minimum mass/unit area of 15kg/m². It may therefore be typically constructed from solid timber of nominal 20mm thickness and with no holes or gaps in its construction.
- The Climbing Wall should be orientated such that the climbing face is away from the nearest dwellings.

214. Bury MBC have commented on the application in relation to hours of use of the external pitches. They recommend a condition requiring the illumination of the pitches to be turned off after 2200hrs each night in order to protect the residential

amenities of the properties adjacent. They also recommend a condition requiring full noise mitigation measures to be in place prior to the bringing into of the use in order to protect the residential amenities of the nearby properties. They believe that these hours are consistent with others applied to similar facilities within the local Bury MBC area and have been confirmed by government appointed Planning Inspectors.

215. Manchester City Council's Environmental Health Officers have requested conditions relating to the implementation of the recommendations set out in the applicant's Acoustic report. They have also recommended that the hours of use for the external pitches of 0900 to 2200hrs Monday to Sunday are attached to any approval.

216. The applicant has confirmed that they agree with the hours of use as recommended by Environmental Health Officers.

217. It is considered that matters relating to noise have been appropriately considered and that the mitigation measures proposed by the applicant and the hours of use confirmed by the applicant are acceptable and would not give rise to a level of disamenity that would warrant refusal of the application. It is considered that the proposal accords with policy DC26.4 of the adopted UDP.

Lighting

218. A significant number of objections have been received that relate to the impact of the proposed sports pitches floodlighting. The impacts raised include those on residential properties, foraging and roosting Bats and the activities of a local astronomy group. Matters relating to Bats and the floodlighting have been considered within the Ecology section of this report.

219. The applicant has provided a drawing indicating the proposed levels of light spillage from the floodlighting required around the small side pitches. They have confirmed that no lighting is proposed to the Tennis Courts/Netball courts, which are located closest to residential properties. These details indicate that the proposed lighting system prevents horizontal light spillage and contains vertical spillage to within 2 metres of the pitch boundaries.

220. In addition to this it is recommended that there are restrictions on the hours of use and lighting of external pitches and areas, including automatic monitors to ensure lights to pitches are switched off when they are not in use will further reduce the potential for any lighting to cause a disturbance to residential properties. The proposed lighting along with the proposed conditions restricting the times that pitches are to be illuminated are considered acceptable and would not give rise to a level of disamenity that would warrant refusal of the application.

Impact on historic park and setting of listed buildings

221. Heaton Park is a Grade II listed park on the Register of Parks and Gardens of special historic interest compiled and maintained by English Heritage. The historic interest of the Park is a result of the creation of the Parks landscape by William Eames and then John Webb in the eighteenth century.

222. Guidance in PPG15 states that “the effect of proposed development on a registered park or garden or its setting is a material consideration in the determination of a planning application”.

223. In its response to the application English Heritage have confirmed that they do not believe that the proposal has a significant impact on the settings of the historic listed building group within the Park “which are effectively screened by the woodland”. It also recognises that the identification of the ‘Sports Zone’ within the Heaton Park Restoration Management Plan was “determined on the basis of minimising the impact on the setting of the main listed building group”. In their initial response they believed the main impact of the development is on the open character of this component space within the park.

224. In their original response to the application English Heritage stated that they did not support the application and set out a number of matters they believed needed addressing through amendments to the proposal. This included:

225. amendments to the proposed car parking area and alterations to the existing area of car parking to the immediate north of the application site;

- reduction in the number of pitches to retain amore fluid space around the complex and open footpath links;
- removal of boundary hedges and separating hedge around the bowling greens;
- pulling back the projecting entrance gate and perimeter fence to the Bowls area, away from the entrance drive;
- retention of the mound and birch trees within the Skate Park.

226. In its response to the amendments made by the applicant to address these concerns, English Heritage acknowledge that the proposals had been moderated but they retained their overall concerns with the scheme and that it is a substantial intervention in the Park and think it will have a negative impact on the character of the parkland.

227. The application site lies within a section of the Park identified as the Sports and Utilities Character Area in the Heaton Park Historic Landscape Survey and Restoration Masterplan prepared in 1998. This document sets out a historic landscape survey and restoration management plan for the park.

228. In its assessment of the area containing the application site the survey sets out the changes that have occurred through the Parks history. The survey notes that it “seems likely that this area was never considered of great importance within Webb’s design.....and the area was never intended to be viewed from the house or its pleasure grounds. The pasture merely formed a part of the circle of meadow which surrounds the pleasure ground on all sides”. Those changes that have occurred in this area have included the construction of the Heaton Park Reservoir in the early 1920s and associated water treatment plan building; substantial alterations to the original tree planting; provision of tennis courts; the incorporation of sports pitches and changing rooms in the interwar years; and a temporary school in the post war years. The survey acknowledges that since the interwar period there has always been the focus of sporting activities in this area of the park which has continued to

present times with the provision of the 4 bowling greens and Pavilion which was a venue for the 2002 Commonwealth Games.

229. The survey sets a number of objectives for this area including the restoration of perimeter plantations to the design and species intended by John Webb; retain, upgrade and where possible extend the sports provision in the area accommodating facilities presently in inappropriate locations elsewhere in the Park; to upgrade the existing St Margaret's entrance to allowing better vehicle access and to upgrade the car park to an appropriate size for the present and future sports use; to remove all inappropriate shrub planting and re-establish the pleasure ground/meadow boundary; to remove all inappropriate buildings site furniture, play equipment.

230. English Heritage believe that whilst sports facilities may well be appropriate, this needs to be balanced against a variety of factors including the desirability to preserve or enhance the historic landscape. In this instance it should include the retention of the openness of this part of the parkland. They believe the proposals will annexe this area of the parkland and detract from the special character of the designed landscape.

231. The applicant has provided a report that assesses the proposals landscape and visual impact. This report considers the Park a high quality landscape as a whole, which is broken down into several areas that each have their own distinct character and sense of importance within the historical context of the park.

232. It states that the area proposed for development has a limited relationship with the surrounding greenbelt and is largely self contained, both in terms of its distinct characteristics when compared with other areas of the park, and its relative enclosure within the mature vegetation of the park setting. Views into the proposed development are limited to areas immediately surrounding the site due to the surrounding topography and vegetation cover.

233. The Historic character of Heaton Park is recognised, it is also noted that the Park has undergone a number of changes from its intended layout. The Historic survey of the Park undertaken in 1998 indicates that the area, which incorporates the application site, was not seen as an intrinsic part of the formal gardens that formed the setting of the listed group of buildings in the original Park design. English Heritage in its response to the application acknowledges that the proposals visual impact on the listed buildings is moderated due to its location. It is not considered that the proposal affects the setting of listed buildings within the park.

234. It is accepted that the proposal will have an impact on this area of the Park. The proposed Pavilion and associated structure with the outdoor pitches will change the character of its use from one that is predominantly informal recreation (apart from the bowling greens) to a more formal recreational use and introduction of an additional building. The change in the type of its use has been considered above within the Open Space section of this report. It is also recognised in considering the application that this area of the Park has seen other physical built additions through the provision of the bowling greens its associated fencing and Pavilion building. However, Heaton Park acts as both a historic reference but also as a public park providing formal and informal recreation activities to residents of Manchester and surrounding boroughs.

The identification of the Sports Zone area was intended to ensure that the provision of modern formal recreational facilities and the structures associated with them did not visually detract from the historic core of the park and buildings.

235. Following careful consideration of the Park and its historic context, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this area of the grade II listed park. The area has been historically chosen for sports facilities provision due to its relationship with the surrounding residential areas and is referenced as such in the Historic Landscape Survey and Restoration Management Plan. The original layout of this area of the Park was not intended to form part of the formal pleasure grounds of Heaton House and it is considered, therefore, that the introduction of further formal recreational facilities is appropriate in this location. The proposal will not materially affect the setting of the listed group of buildings within the park and will re-provide sports facilities (tennis courts) that were previously inappropriately located elsewhere in the Park. The enclosed nature of the application site and wider area will ensure that the proposal does not detract from the special character of the designed landscape elsewhere in the Park. It is therefore, considered that the proposal accords with policy BM13 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan in that it will increase the range of recreation and leisure based activities at Heaton Park and it will preserve and enhance the architectural integrity and educational value of Heaton Hall and its associated features.

Air Pollution

236. A number of objectors have raised issues relating to an increase in air pollution as a result of the proposal and increases in traffic. Whilst the proposal will result in an increase in the number of motorised vehicle movements, the site is considered to be well located in relation to public transport. In addition the proposal incorporates a number of secure cycle parking spaces and the applicant has submitted a Travel Plan Framework with the application. It is not considered that this matter is sufficient enough to warrant refusal of the application.

Design of the Pavilion

237. The proposed Pavilion design is of a contemporary nature. The building is predominantly a sporting facility on a single ground floor level which comprises, a café, main reception area, offices, multi-use suites, toilet facilities, changing areas, and associated sports facilities.

238. The pavilion will be of steel frame construction over clad with timber cladding. Timber cladding will be finished in a timber preservative; the colours to each element of the structure will differ from black to the lounge area and a medium brown to the changing areas. There will be a glazed lobby entrance linking the two halves of the building together. Glazing is also concentrated on the elevation overlooking the pitches to maximise viewing visibility from the lounge area towards the pitches. The glazing will be of double glazed solar control units to manage any issues with solar heat gain and residual glare from the sun. This reduction of unwanted heat gain through solar glare reduces the need for active mechanical cooling, which is energy intensive.

239. It is considered that the design approach and siting of the Pavilion is acceptable; it will provide a strong focal point for the proposal and create a unique feature within the Park.

The use of the Pavilion building

240. As set out in the Green Belt section above, the proposed Pavilion is considered to be an essential facility and therefore appropriate development within the Green Belt. The Pavilion building will provide changing facilities for users of the outdoor facilities as well as ancillary refreshment facilities for users and those people attending to watch the activities taking place. In addition there will be administrative and storage space within the building, which is required to operate the outdoor facilities. The applicant's agent has confirmed that the ancillary facilities such as the Café/Bar within the Pavilion building will not be open to the general public. Taking into consideration the Pavilion buildings location and separation from residential properties it is not considered that the use of the Pavilion will have an undue impact on residential amenity. In addition, it is considered appropriate that a condition be attached to any approval which clarifies that the Pavilion is to only be used as an essential facility in association with the outdoor recreational facilities proposed and for no other purpose which would be contrary to both national policy on Green Belts and policy E2.1 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan.

Restrictive Covenants on development in the Park

241. Mr Ivan Lewis MP and a number of objectors have raised the issue of whether there are restrictive covenants on the Park prohibiting the type of development currently proposed. Whilst this is not a material planning consideration or one that would prevent approval of the current application, the City Solicitor has confirmed no such covenants exist.

Trees

242. The applicant's agent has confirmed that the proposal incorporates the planting of 83 new replacement trees. However, this is not considered to fully mitigate the loss of trees on site as a result of the proposal. A condition relating to the submission of a full landscaping scheme incorporating a full tree replacement scheme is considered appropriate in this instance.

Secure by Design

243. A Crime Impact Assessment has been provided alongside the planning application. Greater Manchester Police 'Design for Security' consider the proposal should achieve Secure By Design accreditation subject to certain measures being incorporated into the proposal. A condition stipulating that the development should achieve Secure by Design accreditation is proposed to be attached to any approval.

Access

244. The proposal has been designed to be fully accessible to all users with: level access and external ramps of 1:21 gradient, all changing rooms being accessible,

and the provision of disabled person car parking spaces. The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of accessibility.

Sustainability

245. The applicant's agent has confirmed that the aspiration is that the proposed Pavilion building will achieve a BREEAM rating of Very Good. In addition they have outlined the measures to be incorporated into the building in relation to energy efficiency and that the wider site will incorporate porous surfaces and sustainable drainage systems.

Community Use

246. The applicant has confirmed that a significant proportion of the proposed facilities hours of opening will be made available to local community groups and schools (both of Bury MBC and Manchester) free of any charge. It is considered appropriate to make the submission of a formal Community Use agreement a condition of any approval. This Community Use agreement should be based on that information already provided by the applicant, which indicates a 60% proportion of the opening hours of the development facilities being devoted to Community access.

247. It is considered that this element of the proposals future use is a significant factor in addressing the loss of general public access for informal recreation purposes in this area of the Park.

Boundary Treatments

248. It is considered that the proposed fencing and boundary treatments are appropriate for the proposal and as considered elsewhere in the report are acceptable in relation to Green Belt policy. The proposed fencing will ensure that both the facility and wider park are secured at those times when the facility will be operational but the remainder of the Park will be closed.

Residential Amenity

249. The proposed development will introduce a more intensive recreational use to an area that is currently used for informal recreational purposes. The proposal will introduce floodlighting and noise from the activities that will take place on the external pitches and play areas. The applicant has provided supporting information relating to noise and lighting and these issues have been considered elsewhere in this report. The application site is well screened from residential properties by existing trees and shrubs and the substantial Park boundary wall. In addition proposed restrictions on hours of use of the external pitches and times of floodlighting; and, the acoustic measures to be installed are considered to be acceptable and not give rise to unacceptable impacts on residential amenity.

250. The proposal will result in an increase in vehicle movements accessing the facility at certain times of the day. However this is not considered to be significant enough to warrant refusal of the application on residential dis-amenity grounds.

Third Party Representations

2c Stanway Road, Whitefield, Manchester, M45 8ES
28 Polefield Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 2GN
54 Hazelhurst Drive, Middleton, Manchester, M24 6TL
56 Beech Court, Salford M6 5FJ
11 Linton Walk, Kersal, M7 3QR
13 Cedar Grove, Prestwich M25 3DY
10 Venwood Court, Prestwich, M25 9UG
23 Green Walk, Prestwich
254 Heywood Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 2GR
878 Middleton Road, Chadderton, Oldham, OL9 9SB
55 Glebelands Road, Prestwich, M25 1WF
18 St Marys Road, Prestwich, ,Manchester, M25 1AP
3 Leach Street, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 3JA
31 Oldfield Road, Prestwich, M25 2GG
46 Polefield Hall Road, Prestwich , M25 2WW
16 Hillcrest Road Prestwich M25 9UD
14 Kielder Hill Middleton M24 6TF
74 Prestwich Hill M25 9Py
9 Bluebell Avenue Moston M40 9PS
12 Hillcrest Road Prestwich Manchester M25 9WD
14 Cawley Avenue Prestwich M25 9TG
12 Hillcrest Road Prestwich Manchester M25 9WD
12 Woodhill Grove Prestwich M25 0AE
3 Lime Grove Prestwich M25 3DX
46 Ludlow Avenue Whitefield M45 6TD
23 Birch Drive Pendlebury M27 4HD
23 Grosvenor Street Prestwich Manchester M25 5EC
5 Maldwyn Avenue Crumpsall
53 Agecroft Road West Prestwich M25 9RF
3 Bent Lane Prestwich Manchester M25 1DL
3c Standmoor Court Park Lane Whitefield M45 7PF
8 Lilac Gorve Prestwich M25 3DT
4 Bishops Road Prestwich
3 Ludlow Avenue Whitefield
3 Stubbs Close Salford M7 3BD
18 Brooklawn Drive Prestwich M25 2GS
86 Scholes Lane Prestwich M25 0AU
10 Freshfield Avenue Prestwich Manchester M25 2GU
12 Peveril Close Whitefield Manchester M45 6NR
10 Freshfield Avenue Prestwich Manchester M25 2GU
2 Oak Lane Whitefield Manchester M45 8CT
5 York Avenue Segley Park Prestwich M25 0FZ
20 Harrow Close Bury BL9 9UD
20 Woodward Road Prestwich M25 9TU
34 Moss Lane Timperley Cheshire WA15 6SZ
8 Swarsbrick Drive Prestwich
Riverside Road Riverside Park M26 2PZ
4 Bannerman Avenue Prestwich Manchester M25 1EA

1 Warwick Road Chorlton-cum-Hardy Manchester M21 0AU
75 St Margarets Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2QT
134 Halliwell Road Prestwich Manchester M25 9SZ
82 Dingle Close Woodland Chace Radcliffe M26 1WW
21 Yew Tree Drive Bredbury Stockport SK6 2HL
27 Hampson Mill Lane Bury
6 Edwards Drive Whitefield M45 8EA
9 Glebelands Road Prestwich M25 1NE
9 Denyne Avenue Prestwich Manchester M25 1EJ
35 Parliament Street Bury BL9 0TE
6 Kenyon Lane Prestwich Manchester M25 1HY
11 Glendevon Place Whitefield Manchester M45 6EH
237 Heywood Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2QH
108 Simister Lane Prestwich M25 2SB
8 Richmond Avenue Prestwich M25 0NA
5 Hunters Hill Bury BL9 8AP
12 Mount Pleasant Prestwich Manchester M25 2 SD
22 Mayfair Avenue Besses'Oth Barn Whitefield Manchester
38 Hilltop Green Whitefield M45 8FQ
21 Parkville Road Prestwich M25 2QG
9 Priory Avenue Salford M7 2HA
7 Milton Road Prestwich M25 1PT
331 Heywood Road Prestwich M25 2RN
290 Bolton Road Radcliffe M26 3GP
14 Daneshill Prestwich Manchester M25 2QL
113 Butterstile Lane Prestwich Manchester M25 9UP
7 Lynton Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2QS
21 Rothay Close Whitefield M45 8BD
44 Brooklawn Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2GS
2 Tweedale Avenue Blackley M9 6WE
11 Mount Pleasant Simister M25 2SD
7a Oak Lane Whitefield Manchester M45 8FT
15 Hope Park Road Prestwich M25 1GE
7 Harrow Close Blackford Bridge Bury BL9 9UD
14 Wilton Court Simister Prestwich M25 2RT
32 Rectory Green Prestwich M25 1BG
28 Ridge Crescent Whitefield Manchester M45 8SW
19 Taunton Grove Whitefield Manchester
12 Smeaton Close Stretford M32 0SY
6 Seputon Street Lostock Hall Preston PR5 5RP
9 Carver Avenue Prestwich Manchester M25 1GA
3 Kirton Walk Blackley M9 0NL
79 St Ann Road Prestwich M25 9OF
24 Duckworth Road Prestwich M25 9QH
10 Oaklands Drive Prestwich
10 Rat Lane Whitefield
85 Carr Avenue Prestwich M25 9TT
1 Ostrich Lane Prestwich M25 1JJ
8 Wallwork Street Radcliffe
40 Sandgate Road Whitefield Manchester

7 Masefield Avenue Prestwich M25 9QW
37 Cuckoo Lane Whitefield Manchester M45 0TE
4 Hilton Drive Prestwich M25 9NW
15 St Aidans Grove Salford M7 3TN
25 Highfield Road Prestwich
3 Lynton Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2QS
107 Butterstile Lane Prestwich
12 Mount Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2QQ
18 Morley Street Whitefield M45 6GF
20 Silburn Avenue Blackley Manchester M9 0WN
421 Bury Old Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1ES
4 Leah Gardens Rainsough Brew Prestwich M25 9SL
18 Harlech Avenue Whitefield Manchester M45 6UE
3 Sunnyfield Road Prestwich M25 9GF
21 Thatch Leach Lane Whitefield Manchester M45 6EN
27 Ogden Street Prestwich M25 1JL
7 Grosvenor Street Prestwich Manchester M25 1GL
7 Eastleigh Road M25 0BQ
30 Poppythorn Lane Prestwich Manchester M25 3BY
4 The Residences Prestwich M25 0WY
Flat 15 Kingsley House 15 Newton Street Manchester M1 1HE
41 Bannerman Avenue Prestwich M25 1DZ
27 Woodhill Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 0AF
2 Thorley Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2SN
6 Langley Grange Prestwich Manchester M25 3EA
16 Spring Avenue Whitefield M45 7SW
36 Orange Hill Road Prestwich M25 3BE
23 Frankton Road Whitefield M45 7FB
51 Malton Avenue Whitefield M45 8PR
2 Roseland Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2GX
68 Rectory Green Prestwich Manchester M25 1BG
79 Ostrich Lane Heaton Park Prestwich M25 1DQ
6 The Coppice Prestwich M25 1ED
3 St Margarets Close Prestwich M25 2LY
125 Daisy Field Court Bury BL8
14 Woodhill Drive Prestwich M25 0AD
3 Ludlow Avenue Whitefield
84 Rectory Green Prestwich Manchester M25 1BG
29 Duckworth Road Prestwich M25 9GF
7 Raglan Avenue Whitefield M45 6US
24 Talbot Drive Bolton
30 Harlech Avenue Whitefield
48 Beechcroft Prestwich Manchester M25 0AL
6 Sheffield Road Prestwich
41 Downham Crescent Prestwich M25 0EH
44 Witham Street Heywood
14 Conway Avenue M45 7AZ
95 Rectory Green restwich M25 1RJ
23 Guest Road Prestwich M25 3DJ
3 Lime Grove Prestwich M25 3DX

105 Alt Lane Alt Fold Oldham OL8 2EX
5 Roseland Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2GX
Nat West Bank PO Box 305 11 Spring Gardens Manchester M60 2DB
1 Milldyke Close Marton Blackpool FY4 5PB
18 Droughts Lane Simister Prestwich M25 2ST
30 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PT
866 Manchester Road Bury BL9 8DW
3 Ross Avenue Whitefield
140 Heywood Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1LE
9 Ridge Crescent Whitefield Manchester M45 8EQ
51 Downham Crescent Prestwich
10 Ludlow Avenue Whitefield Manchester M45 6TD
60 Stapleford Close Manchester M23 2SJ
28 Ash Grove Prestwich Manchester M25 3DS
12 Winster Close Whitefield M45 8HN
131 Clifton Road Prestwich M25 3HA
26 Delaunays Road Crumpsall Manchester M8 4QS
391 Bury Old Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PS
9 Willow Road Prestwich Manchester M25 3DZ
9 Farm Lane Simister M25 2PX
4 Hamilton Road Prestwich Manchester
5 Fellfoot Close Boothstown
154 Rectory Green Prestwich
39 Derby Road Whitefield Manchester M45 6TW
5 Elm Avenue Outwood Manchester M26 1DR
17 Chadderton Drive Unsworth BL9 8WL
10 Vernon Drive Prestwich M25 9RA
19 St Margarets Road Holyrood Prestwich Manchester M25 2GT
33 St Margarets Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GT
14 Cowley Avenue Prestwich M25 9FQ
3 Butt Hill Drive Prestwich M25 9PL
3 Willow Road Prestwich M25 3DZ
2b Overdale Swinton M27 4WZ
8 Hastings Avenue Whitefield Manchester M45 6UR
13 Seabank Road Heswall Wirral CH60 4SN
28 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PT
111 Polefield Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GN
11 Polefield Approach Prestwich M25 2WR
63 Sherbourne Court Prestwich Manchester M25 3BN
12 Bond Street Bury
15 Halliwell Road Prestwich M25 9SY
159 Butterstile Lane Prestwich M25 9UW
12 Ferndene Road Prestwich M25 2RB
8 Flower Road Higher Blackley
6 Malvern Close Prestwich M25 1PH
1 Goats Gate Terrace Whitefield M25 7SH
23 Guest Road Prestwich M25 3DJ
3 Riverside Drive Summerseat Bury
8 Butterstile Lane Prestwich Manchester M25 9PW
25 Orange Hill Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1LR

10 Cavendish Road M7 4WW
8 Mountside Crescent Prestwich Manchester M25 3JF
2b Chapel Street Adlington Chorley PR7 4JL
135 Heywood Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1LF
13 Lowther Close Prestwich Manchester M25 9LN
9 Holyrood Close Prestwich Manchester M25 1QD
13 Jenwood Road Prestwich Manchester M25 9UB
5 Bowker Vale Gardens Manchester M9 8EY
36 Park Street Prestwich Manchester M25 1GT
89 Polefield Hall Road Prestwich M25 2WW
4 Tauton Grove Whitefield Manchester M45 6TJ
33 Bury Old Road Whitefield Manchester
4 Noreen Avenue Prestwich Manchester M25 1LT
44 Poppythorn Lane Prestwich Manchester M25 3BY
11 Bland Road Prestwich Manchester
9 Rectory Avenue Prestwich M25 1BB
18 Yew Street Salford M7 2HL
12 Woodhill Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 0AD
11 Winterburn Avenue Bolton BL2 3FY
18 North Circle Whitefield Manchester M45 7AT
24 Oakbank Close Whitefield M45 8FP
17 Wilmer Avenue Whitefield Manchester M45 6DN
2 Polefield Hall Road Prestwich M25 2WN
14 Rooden Court Prestwich M25 1JP
14 Kirtley Avenue Monton M30 9PY
279 Heywood Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2RA
214 Heywood Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GH
63 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PL
14 Langley Hall Road Prestwich Manchester M25 3DA
122 Park Lane Whitefield Manchester M45 7PT
19 Harlech Avenue Whitefield
10 Wayne Avenue Prestwich M25 1EJ
Flat 4 Poppythorn Court Prestwich M25 1ND
33 Parkville Road Prestwich M25 2QG
Fellyndham Avenue Swinton Manchester M27 8PY
2 Park Place Prestwich Manchester M25 1QZ
44 Agecroft Road East Prestwich Manchester M25 9RT
42 Perrymead Prestwich M25 2QJ
97 Givendale Crumpsall Manchester
27 Venwood Road Prestwich M25 9UE
4 Buckley Lane Prestwich Manchester M45 7JZ
24 Daleswood Avenue Whitefield Manchester M45 7WP
8 Meadow Croft Whitefield Manchester M45 7ND
7 Lowther Close Prestwich M25 9LN
26 Gore Avenue Salford
5 Well Grove Whitefield Manchester M45 8SQ
9 Heybrook Walk Whitefield
32 Seddon Street Radcliffe Manchester
9 Bolbury Crescent Swinton M27 8AJ
12 Lowther Road Crumpsall

3 Leach Street Prestwich Manchester M25 3JA
5 St Margarets Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2QB
37 Sargent Road M45 7TR
17 Gan Eden Stanley Road Salford
53 Beechcroft Prestwich Manchester M25 0AL
2 Hazel Lane Hollins Oldham OL8 3TY
6 Rectory Gardens Prestwich Manchester M25 1DB
125 Rectory Green Prestwich M25 1BQ
28 Simister Green Prestwich Manchester M25 2RY
82 Lowther Road Prestwich M25 9QP
258 Wythenshawe Road Manchester M23 0WT
20 Brooklands Drive Prestwich M25 2GS
Flat 5 Kempton M22 1TX
34 Church Drive Prestwich M25 3JW
1 Robert Street M25 1HG
15 Penrith Avenue Whitefield Manchester M45 6UJ
49 Hardfield Road Alkrington Middleton Manchester M24 1JA
32 Bland Road Prestwich Manchester M25 9WG
182 Heywood Road Prestwich M28 1LH
7 Windle Avenue Higher Crumpsall Manchester M8 4NY
2 Mellor Street Prestwich M25 3HT
15 The Meadows Prestwich M25 1DT
14 Sunningdale Drive Prestwich M25 1JX
19 Hopwood Court Middleton Manchester
8 Ash Grove Prestwich M25 3DS
269 Heywood Road Prestwich M25 2QR
6 Charlton Avenue Prestwich M25 0PH
21 Lime Avenue Whitefield M45 7FW
27 Carrington Road Stockport SK1 2JX
27 Oswald Road Chorlton
32 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PT
90 Cuckoo Lane Prestwich M25 2NG
Apartment 4 Church Mews Devonshire Place Prestwich Manchester M25 3FF
72 Milton Road Prestwich M25 1PT
48 Tennyson Road Middleton Manchester
10 St Margarets Close Prestwich Manchester M25 2LY
53 Agecroft Road West Prestwich M25 9RF
6 Edwards Drive Whitefield M45 8EA
11 Headlands Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 9YF
57 Downruth Crescent M25
Flat 2 Crossley Court Ancoats Manchester M4 7AS
1 St Margarets Close Prestwich Manchester M25 2LY
67 Wensley Road Salford M7 3GJ
31 Bannerman Avenue Prestwich M25 1DZ
18 Harlech Avenue Whitefield Manchester M45 6UE
114 Randale Drive Sunnybank Bury BL9 8NE
20 Langley Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1NF
250 Stand Lane Radcliffe
43 Leach Street Prestwich
135 Butterstile Lane Prestwich M25 9UW

1 St Anns Close Prestwich M25 9LJ
13 The Drive Prestwich M25 1BJ
30 Penrhyn Avenue Middleton Manchester M24 6EQ
90 Lymsfield Drive Worsley M25 1WA
7 Brookfield Prestwich M25 1EL
7 Pine Street Haslingden Rossendale BB4 5ND
57 Milton Road Prestwich M25 1PU
13 The Square Swinton M27 5RL
150 Norden Road Bamford Rochdale OL11 5PT
10 Exeter Avenue Radcliffe Manchester M26 3WX
23 Nuttall Avenue Whitefield Manchester M45 6QA
1 Wensley Road Salford 7
c/o The Phoenix Centre St Marys Park St Marys Road Prestwich M25 1GG
2 Ernest Street Prestwich Manchester M25 3HZ
2 Wellington Road Eccles M30 0DP
30 Orange Hill Road Prestwich M25 1LS
5 Wordsworth Gardens Prestwich
4 Pleasant View M9 8WJ
61 Bulrush Close Worsley Manchester M28 3GT
34 Mount Road Prestwich M25 2QQ
28 Furness Avenue Whitefield
25 Ruper Street Radcliffe M26 1BC
12 Middleton Drive Bury BL9 8DS
135 Simister Lane Prestwich
3a Deyne Avenue Prestwich M25 1EB
4 Herbert Street Prestwich M25 3HH
73 Woodward Road Prestwich M25
31 Agecroft Road West Prestwich M25 7RE
6 Errol Avenue Manchester M9 0PF
5 Shakespear Road Prestwic M25 9GW
63 Turks Road Radcliffe Manchester M26 4GA
30 Beech Avenue Whitefield M45 7EW
7 Roseland Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2GX
27 Ogden Street Prestwich Manchester M25 1JL
26 Worcester Road Swinton
16 St Margarets Close Prestwich M25 2LY
51 Glebelands Road Prestwich Manchester
32 Hereford Drive Prestwich Prestwich Manchester M25 0AG
7 Hilltop Avenue Prestwich M25 1LL
7 Roseland Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2GX
79 Heaton Street Prestwich Manchester M25 1HH
Clifton Road Prestwich M25 3JT
18 St Margarets Close Prestwich Manchester M25 2LY
Deyne Avenue M25 1EJ
261 Heywood Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2QR
Birch Villa 15a Polefield Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2QA
Dearden Clough House Rochdale Road Edenfield Ramsbottom BL0 0RF
The Old Vicarage St Margarets Road Prestwich M25 2QB
10 Stanway Road Whitefield Manchester M45 8EG
27 Naesby Walk Whitefield Manchester M45 8JU

37 Cuckoo Lane Whitefield Manchester M45 0TE
110 Bury New Road M25 6AA
5 Roseland Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2GX
325 Heywood Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2RF
119 Ostrich Lane Prestwich M25 1DQ
9 Wilton Court Prestwich Manchester M25 2RT
45 Egerton Street Prestwich M25 1FQ
9 Woodgate Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2QZ
47 Sherbourne Court Prestwich Manchester M25 3BN
18 Sandgate Road Whitefield Manchester M45 6WG
25 Simister Green Prestwich M25 2RY
14 Bucking Avenue Whitefield
34b Hastings Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PF
7 Lowther Close Prestwich M25 9LN
63 Brooklands Road Prestwich M25 0FB
16 Alexandre Avenue Whitefield M45 6DW
7 Farm Lane Simister Prestwich M25 2RX
45 Mount Road Prestwich M25 2GP
13 Tawnton Grove Whitefield M45 6TJ
8 Holmfield Avenue Prestwich M25 0BH
29 Bolbury Crescent Pendlebury Swinton M27 8AJ
12 St Margarets Close Prestwich
190 Heywood Road Prestwich M25 1LD
40 Beeston Grove Whitefield M45 6UF
22 Mount Pleasant Prestwich M25 2SD
Clifton Road Prestwich M25 3JT
91 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1DU
17a St Margarets Road Prestwich M25 2GT
18 Conway Avenue Whitefield M45 7AZ
6 Lidgate Grove Didsbury Manchester M20 6TS
21 Leach Street Prestwich Manchester M25 3JA
8 CARR drive Prestwich Manchester M25 9TA
3 Kirton Walk Blackley M9 0NL
44 St Josephs Avenue Whitefield Manchester M45 6NT
22 Polefield Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GN
144 St Anns Road Prestwich
20 Deyne Avenue Prestwich M5 1EJ
32 Middleton Drive Bury BL9 8DS
7 Hilltop Avenue Prestwich M25 1LL
11 St Margarets Close Prestwich M25Y
14 Mersey Drive M45 8LF
11 Sash Grove Bguley Manchester M23 1BR
31 Lowton Street Radcliffe Manchester M26 4DQ
9 Brooklawn Drive Prestwich Manchester M25
29 Ruskin Road Prestwich M25 9QN
2 Mountride Crescent Prestwich Manchester M25 3JF
62 Tamworth Avenue Whitefield M45 6LA
Flat 2 23 Falkner Street Liverpool L8 7PU
42 Leach Mews Prestwich M25 3HL
20 Polefield Grange Prestwich Manchester M25 2WL

7 Raglan Avenue Witefield M46US
20 Oak Lane Whitefield M45 8ET
11 East Meade Prestwich
10 Newburn Avenue Higher Blackley Manchester M9 6HU
8 Ladythorn Avenue Prestwich
2 Meadway Chadderton OL9 8DP
28 Maple Avenue Whitefield Manchester M45 7EP
50 Stanley Street Prestwich M25 1FR
9 Polefield Circle Prestwich Manchester M25 2NP
9 Oldfield Road Prestwich
4 Higher Lane Whitefield
19 Circular Road Prestwich Manchester M25 9NR
49 Dumers Lane Radcliffe
26 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PT
3 Parr Fold Unsworth Bury BL9 8JB
2 Norwood Prestwich Manchester M25 9WA
6 Hampton Road Urmston M41 9AL
Lancaster Cottage 55 Milton Road Heaton Park Manchester M25 1PT
113 Butterstile Lane Prestwich Manchester M25 9UP
13 Brookfield Prestwich Manchester
2 Highreid Road Prestwich Manchester
21 Mather Avenue Whitefield Manchester M45 8NU
27 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PT
4 Buckley Prestwich
75 Glebelands Road M25 1WF
8 Byron Avenue Prestwich M25 9LT
97 Givondale Drive Manchester M8 4PZ
Clough Farm Clough Walk Prestwich M25 3JD
30 Poppythorn Lane Prestwich Manchester M25 3BY
224 Heywood Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GH
48 Outwood Road Radcliffe M26 1AG
23 Whitehouse Avenue Crumpsall M8 4LA
Moss Cottage 12 Droughts Lane Simister Prestwich M25 2ST
105 Windsor Road Prestwich M25 0DF
17 Bowker Vale Gardens Blackley M9 8ey
15 Kinpy Avenue Whitefield M45 7DJ
5 Hilton Crescent Prestwich
46 Parrenthorn Road Prestwich M25 2RL
24 The Croft Pilsworth Road Hollins Bury BL9 8RL
4 Hastings Close Whitefield M45 6UQ
19 Pardentuorn Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2RH
19 Guest Road Manchester M25 3DJ
54 Beechcroft Prestwich Manchester M25 0AL
38 Willow Road Prestwich Manchester
1 Sandown Road Bury BL9 8HN
21 Leach Street Prestwich Manchester M25 3JA
31 Andover Avenue Middleton
27 St Margarets Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GT
16 Boxow Road Little Lever Bolton BL3 1AH
47 Chapel Road Prestwich M25 9SS

48 Heys Road Prestwich M25 1JY
509 Bury Old Road Prestwich Manchester M25 3DE
17 Trimley Avenue M40 8GW
21 Upper Moss Lane Hulme Manchester M15 5JG
Merton Road Prestwich Manchester
27 Brooklawn Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2GS
74 Rectory Green Prestwich M25 1BG
14 Church Drive Prestwich M25 3JW
1a St Margarets Close Prestwich Manchester M25 2LY
25 Dudley Avenue Whitefield M45 6BS
17 St Margarets Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GT
55 Duckworth Road Prestwich Manchester M25 9GF
5 Oxendale Drive Middleton M24 4FN
89 Peveril Close Whitefield M45 6NS
866 Manchester Road Bury BL9 8DW
258 Heywood Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GR
15 Highfield Road Prestwich M25 3AQ
21 St Margarets Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GT
53 Medlock Way M45 8MX
4 Mildred Avenue Prestwich Manchester
Rochdale Manchester
4 Coulsden Drive Blackley
41 George Street South Salford M7 4PN
11 Park Road Wilmslow SK9 5BT
35 Worsley Street Radcliffe M26 3AS
120 Cuckoo Lane Prestwich Manchester M25 2NG
4 Buckley Lane Prestwich Manchester M45 7JZ
12 Waverley Road M24 6JC
26 Ruskin Road Prestwich
51 Peveril Close Whitefield
81 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PL
21 Highfield Drive Middleton M24 1DJ
8 Butterstile Lane Prestwich Manchester M25 9PW
12 Waverley Road Hollin Middleton
15 Mayfield Road Salford
Princess Road Prestwich
81 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PL
32 Irwell Street Bury BL9 0HE
21 Brooklawn Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2GS
1 Woodgate Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2QZ
343 Haywood Road M25
9 Dalebeck Close Whitefield Manchester M45 8HZA
14 Neville Road Kersal Salford M7 3PS
21 Milton Road Prestwich
15 Sandringham Grange Prestwich Manchester M25 0BY
27 Beech Avenue Whitefield M45 7EN
34 Holyrood Road M25 1PE
5 Phillips Place Whitefield Manchester M45 7HA
4 Wilton Court Prestwich M25 2RT
The Crescent Prestwich

40 Rudlow Avenue Whitefield Manchester M45 6TD
2 Carlton Avenue Prestwich Manchester M25 0EB
20 Randiesham Street Prestwich M25 1CR
4 Carrisbrook Avenue Whitefield Manchester M45 6UP
187 Heywood Road Prestwich
2 Ladythorn Court Prestwich Manchester M25 9HP
26 Stanley Street Prestwich M25 1EG
55 Hill Lane Blackley M9 6PE
16 Rooden Court Parks Street Prestwich M25 1JP
7 Hilltop Avenue Whitefield M45 8FG
50 Sandy Hill Court Blackley
12 Sherwood Avenue Radcliffe
1 Globe Lane Egerton Bolton BL7 9TD
36 Cardigan Drive Redvales Bury BL 9 9LG
8 Butterstile Lane Prestwich Manchester M25 9PW
9 Polefield Approach Prestwich Manchester M25 2WR
38 Lakeside Rise Blackley Manchester M9 8QR
77 Parkfield Road New Moston M40 3RG
1 Grosvenor Street Prestwich M25 1GL
23 Gardener Road Prestwich Manchester M25 3HX
21 Walkden Road Walkden Manchester M28 3DA
30 Watkins Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 0DS
42 Outwood Road Radcliffe Manchester M26 1AG
18 Polefield Gardens Prestwich M25 2NW
Swelford Road Crumpsall Manchester M8 4NZ
46 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PT
32 Irwell Street Bury BL9 0HE
199 Pole Lane Court Unsworth Bury BL9 8QD
3 Hastings Close Whitefield M45 6UQ
99 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PU
35 Stanway Road Whitefield M45 8EX
13 Polofield Gardens Prestwich M25 2NW
40 Polefield Road Prestwich M25 2GM
25 Merton Road Prestwich
418 Bury Road Townsend Fold Rossendale
Birch Villa 15a Polefield Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2QA
11 Laburnum Grove Prestwich M25 3DW
50 Prestwich Hills Prestwich Manchester M25 9PY
42 Mather Avenue Whitefield M45 8WX
152 Reteng Green Prestwich M25 1BR
149 St Anns Road Prestwich M25 9QL
1 Walmsley Gardens Prestwich M25 3EF
302 Beaumont Building M3 1DX
13 Mountside Crescent Prestwich M25 3JF
42 Manchester Road Bury BL9 0TL
51 The Meadows Prestwich
38 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PT
88 Stand Lane Radcliffe M26 1JW
31 Scholes Walk Prestwich
Avon Cottage Clifton Road Prestwich M25 3JT

21 Sandgate Road Whitefield
1 Dalesman Close Manchester M9 4GF
135 Randale Drive Unsworth Bury BL9 8NE
6 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PT
4 Oldfield Road Prestwich M25 2GG
10 St Marys Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1AP
26 Leyton Drive Bury
16 Beaufort Street Prestwich M25 1EX
14 St Marys Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1AP
1 Carver Avenue Prestwich Manchester M25 1GA
391 Bury Old Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PS
245 Heywood Road Prestwich M25 2QH
12 Brow Walk Lionfold Blackley Manchester
32 Fairway Prestwich Manchester M2 0JH
250 Heywood Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GR
23 Mount Road Prestwich M25 2GP
23 St Margarets Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GT
12 Malvern Close Prestwich M25 1PH
1 Woodgate Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2QZ
1a St Margaret' Close Prestwich Manchester M25 2LY
1b St Margarets Close Prestwich Manchester M25 2LY
32 Mount Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2QQ
46 Milton Road Heaton Park Prestwich M25 1PT
1 Woodgate Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2QZ
1 Heaton Lodge Bury Old Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1NZ
1 Muirfield Close Prestwich Manchester M25 1PW
10 Freshfield Avenue Prestwich Manchester M25 2GU
10 High Bank Grove Prestwich Manchester M25 1EY
10 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PT
10 St Margaret's Close Prestwich Manchester M25 2LY
104 Blackley New Road Blackley Manchester M9 8EG
11 Oldfield Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GG
11 Woodgate Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2QZ
11 Woodgate Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2QZ
12 Bradshaw Fold Ave New Moston Manchester M40 0JY
12 Bradshaw Fold Ave New Moston Manchester M40 0JY
121 Ostrich Lane Prestwich M25 1DQ
128 Warwick Avenue Whitefield Manchester M45 6TX
13 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PN
13 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PT
13 Seabank Road Heswall Wirral CH60 4SN
14 St Margarets Close Prestwich Manchester M25 2LY
14 St Margarets Close Prestwich Manchester M25 2LY
14 St Marys Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1AP
15 Sandringham Grange Prestwich Manchester M25 0BY
15 Ashdale Drive Withington Manchester M20 4TF
15 Brooklawn Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2GS
15 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PN
16 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PN
16 Park Road M8 4HU

164 Gaskell Street Manchester M40 1BF
17 Polefield Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2QA
17 Prestwich Park Road South Prestwich Manchester M25 9PF
18 Rooden Court Park Street Prestwich Manchester M25 1JP
18 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PN
18 Parkway Blackley Manchester M9 0QJ
18 Rooden Court Park Street Prestwich Manchester M25 1JP
19 Ruskin Road Manchester M25 9QN
19 Waingate Close Rossendale BB4 7SQ
1b St Margarets Close Prestwich Manchester M25 2LY
2 Arlington Avenue Prestwich Manchester
2 Stone Pale Whitefield Manchester
2 Park Place Prestwich Manchester M25 1QZ
2 Arlington Avenue Prestwich M25 9NF
2 Carver Avenue Prestwich Manchester M25 1GA
2 Downham Grove Prestwich Manchester M25 0GB
2 Earl St Prestwich Manchester M25 1 GQ
2 St Margarets Close Prestwich Manchester M25 2LY
20 Paxton Place Manchester M11 3NL
20 Daneshill Prestwich Manchester M25 2QL
21 St Margaret's Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GT
21 Polefield Road Prestwich M25 2QA
22 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PN
222 Heywood Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GH
232 Heywood Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GW
24 St Margarets Close Prestwich Manchester M25 2LY
24 Ash Grove Prestwich M25 3DS
24 Brooklawn Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2GS
24 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PN
24 St Margarets Close Prestwich M25 2LY
25 Sheepfoot Lane Prestwich Manchester M25 OBN
25 Polefield Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2QA
25 Sheepfoot Lane Prestwich Manchester M25 OBN
25 St Margarets Close Prestwich Manchester M25 2LY
25 St Margarets Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GT
26 Beech Avenue Whitefield Manchester M45 7EW
26 Horne Street Bury BL9 9BW
26 Polefield Road Prestwich M25 2GN
26 Powell Street Bury BL8 2BG
27 Green End Denton Manchester M34 7PT.
27 Oakwell Drive Unsworth Bury BL9 8LB
271 Heywood Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2QR
271 Heywood Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2QR
28 Farm Lane Simister M25 2RX
28 Scholes Walk Prestwich
28 The Meadows Prestwich M25 1DT
29 Mount Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GP
29 St Margarets Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GT
29 Billberry Close Whitefield Manchester M45 8BL
29 Brooklawn Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 2GS

29 Circular Road Prestwich Manchester M25 9NR
29 Great Cheetham Street Salford Manchester M27 2JB
29 Parkville Road Prestwich M25 2QG
29 Sedgley Park Road Prestwich Manchester M25 0BJ
29 Simister Lane Prestwich Manchester
29 ST MARGARETS ROAD Prestwich Manchester M25
29 Tamworth Avenue Whitefield Manchester M45 6UH
3 Branksome Avenue Prestwich Manchester M25 1AG
3 Clough Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 3JS
3 Freshfield Avenue Prestwich Manchester M25 2GU
3 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PN
307 Heywood Road Prestwich M25 2KQ
31 Coppleridge Drive Crumpsall Manchester M8 4PB
31 Dovedale Avenue Prestwich Manchester M25 0BT
31 St Margaret's Road Prestwich Manchester M31 2GT
32 Brentwood Court Lowther road Prestwich M25 9PX
32 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PL
32 Middleton Drive Bury BL9 8DS
32 Mount Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2QQ
32 Orford Road Prestwich Manchester M25 3DB
329 Heywood Road Prestwich
33 Sheepfoot Lane Prestwich M25 0DL
33 St Margaret's Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GT
33 Scott Road Prestwich Manchester M25 9GN
34 Parrbrook Close Whitefield M45 8WE
34 Polefield Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GN
34 Vine Street Salford M7 3PG
35 St Margarets Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GT
35 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PN
353 Barlow Road Altrincham WA14 5HT
36 Kenilworth Avenue Whitefield M45 6TG
36 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PL
36 Simister Lane Prestwich Manchester M25 2RZ
36 Woodhill Drive Prestwich M25 0AF
37 Sheepfoot Lane Prestwich Manchester M25 0DL
37 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PT
37 Sheepfoot Lane Prestwich M25 0DL
37 St Margaret's Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GT
38 Green Walks Prestwich Manchester M25 1DS
381 Bury New Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1AW
397 Bury Old Road Manchester M25 1PS
4 Holyrood Close Prestwich Manchester M25 1QD
4 Kings Close Prestwich Manchester M25 1QE
4 Neath Close Whitefield Manchester M45 6NL
4 St Margarets Road Prestwich Manchester M40 0JE
4 The Drive Prestwich
40 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PT
41 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PT
410 Bury Old Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PZ
418 Bury Old Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PZ

42 Dale Road Middleton Manchester M24 2WA
42 Sandgate Road Whitefield Manchester M45 6WG
43 Venwood Rd Prestwich Manchester M25 9UF
49 Heaton Street Prestwich Manchester M25 1HS
49 Peveril Close Whitefield Manchester M45 6NS
49 Polefield Road Prestwich M25 2GN
49 St Margaret's Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2QT
492 Victoria Avenue M9 0PL
5 Deyne Avenue Prestwich Manchester M25 1EJ
5 Fernedene Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2RB
5 Perrymead Prestwich Manchester M25 2QJ
5 Freshfield Avenue Prestwich Manchester M25 2GU
5 Muirfield Close Prestwich Manchester M25 1PW
50 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PT
51 Coalshaw Green Road Chadderton Oldham OL9 8JW
51 Derby Court Bury Manchester BL9 6WG
52 Hardmans Road Whitefield Manchester M45 7BD
52 Parkstone Avenue Whitefield M45 7QH
57 St Margarets Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2QT
58 Kenilworth Avenue Whitefield Manchester
59 Brongwinau Comins Coch Aberystwyth SY23 3BQ
59 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PT
6 Langley Gardens Prestwich Manchester M25 3EF
6 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PN
6 Lidgate Grove Didsbury Manchester M20 6TS
6 Belmore Avenue Manchester M8 4EF
6 Carver Avenue Prestwich Manchester M25 1GA
6 Langley Gardens Prestwich Manchester M25 3EF
6 Lidgate Grove Didsbury Manchester M20 6TS
61 Simister Green Prestwich Manchester M25 2RY
61 Butterstile Close Prestwich M25 9DH
61 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PU
61 St Margaret's Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2QT
62 Heywood Road Prestwich
62 Wellington Grove Cale Green Stockport Sk2 6SL
63 Mitton Road Prestwich Manchester
67 Whittaker Lane M25 1ET
69 Polefield Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2GN
69 St Margaret's Road Prestwich Manchester M25 2QT
7 Pine Street Haslingden Rossendale BB4 5ND
7 Carver Avenue Manchester M25 1GA
7 Chapel Hill Littleborough OL15 9DD
7 Glebelands Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1NE
7 Langroyd Walk Cheetham Hill M8 9AX
7 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M22 1PN
7 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PT
7 Pinfold Avenue Blackley Manchester M9 7DW
7 Spruce Crescent Bury BL9 6QW
71 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PL
72 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PT

72 Longford Street Manchester M18 8GQ
73 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PL
75 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PL
76 Downham Crescent Prestwich Manchester M25 0FH
8 Carver Avenue Prestwich Manchester M25 1GA
8 Ernest Street Prestwich Manchester M25 3HZ
8 Gilmore Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 1NB
8 Penrhyn Drive Prestwich Manchester M25 1LW
8 Stobart Avenue Prestwich Manchester M25 0AJ
80 Clifton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 3HR
80 Shelley Road Swinton Manchester M27 0PB
82 Glebelands Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1NJ
83 Harper Fold Road Radcliffe Manchester M26 3XQ
83 Hilton Lane Prestwich M25 9SD
84 Victoria Avenue East Blackley Manchester M9 6HF
85 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PL
87 PEVERIL CLOSE WHITEFIELD MANCHESTER M45 6NS
89 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PL
9 Egerton St Prestwich M25 1FS
9 St Margarets Close Prestwich Manchester M25 2LY
9 Ballantine Street Newton Heath Manchester M40 1RT
9 Egerton St Prestwich Manchester M25 1FS
9 Grosvenor Street Prestwich M25 1GL
9 Ridge Crescent Whitefield Manchester M45 8EQ
9 St Margarets Close Prestwich Manchester M25 2LY
9 Tavistock Road Ashton-on-Mersey Sale Manchester M33 5JA
90 Milton Road Prestwich M25 1PU
91 Merton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PL
93 Milton Road Prestwich Manchester M25 1PU
Apartment A1-8 Great Northern Tower 1 Watson Street Manchester
Flat 8 Holyrood Court Prestwich Manchester M25 1PG
Heritage Lottery Fund NW 9th Floor 82 King Street Manchester M2 4WQ
St. Margaret's Vicarage 2 St. Margaret's Road Prestwich MANCHESTER M25 2QB
The Acorns Middleton Road Manchester M8 4NB

Human Rights Act 1998 considerations – This application needs to be considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Under Article 6, the applicants (and those third parties, including local residents, who have made representations) have a right to a fair hearing and to this end the Committee must give full consideration to their comments.

Protocol 1 Article 1, and Article 8 where appropriate, confer(s) a right of respect for a person's home, other land and business assets. In taking account of all material considerations, including Council policy as set out in the Unitary Development Plan, the Head of Planning has concluded that some rights conferred by these Articles on the applicant(s)/objector(s)/resident(s) and other occupiers and owners of nearby land that might be affected may be interfered with but that interference is in accordance with the law and justified by being in the public interest and on the basis of the planning merits of the development proposal. He believes that any restriction on these rights posed by the approval of the application is proportionate to the wider

benefits of approval and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

Recommendation

The Head of Planning therefore recommends that the Committee **APPROVE** planning application 090370/FO/2009/N1 because, the proposal will provide significant formal recreational facilities within a major public park that will meet identified shortfalls in this type of sports provision in both the north of Manchester and the Prestwich area of Bury MBC. The proposal has been sited to: minimise the impact on the settings of the listed buildings within the Park; and, to reduce the visual impact on the historic landscape, so that the setting of the listed buildings is preserved. With the inclusion of the proposed mitigation measures it is not considered that the proposal will give rise to unacceptable impacts on adjacent properties either through noise, light or increases in traffic. The proposal will not impact on European Protected species so as to disturb them within the meaning of the 1994 Regulations. Following careful consideration the local planning authority does not believe that the overall proposal is inappropriate development or that it will conflict with the intentions of Green Belt policy or the purposes of including land within it as set out in PPG2. The proposal accords with policies BM13, E2.1, H2.2, DC26.4, L1.4 which are summarised in the body of the report and there are no material considerations which outweigh the benefits of the proposal.

Conditions and/or Reasons:

Interpretation.

In these conditions, the following expressions shall have the following meanings:

Essential Facility	Shall mean a place providing changing areas, refreshment and training facilities for users of the Outdoor Sporting Facilities and those accompanying them at the time users of the Outdoor Sporting Facilities need to be present in order to participate in sport and space for such administrative functions as are necessary for the efficient running of the Outdoor Sporting Facilities and space for the storage of equipment necessary for the use and maintenance of the Outdoor sporting Facilities
Outdoor Sporting Facilities	Shall mean the areas for use as football, netball, tennis, climbing wall facilities shown on the AEDAS plan drawing number 010 rev P17 date stamped as received by the local planning authority on the 24 th December 2009.
Pavilion	Shall mean the building for use as an Essential Facility shown on AEDAS plan drawing number 010 rev P17 date stamped as received by the local planning authority on the 24 th December 2009+ and the associated ground floor plan as

	shown on AEDAS drawing number 100 P9 date stamped as received by the local planning authority on the 17 th June 2009
--	---

1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason - Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2) No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used for the construction of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed only using the approved materials unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable to the City Council as local planning authority in the interests of the visual amenity of the area within which the site is located, as specified in policy E2.1, H2.2; of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

3) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority:

Drawing numbers:

TPM 05 Rev B
AEDAS 015
AEDAS 005
AEDAS 100 Rev P9
AEDAS 201 Rev P4
AEDAS 200 Rev P4

All date stamped as received by the local planning authority 17.06.2009

Philips ADP090709

AEDAS 031 date stamped as received by the local planning authority 22.12.2009

TPM 04 Rev G
AEDAS 010 Rev P17
date stamped as received by the local planning authority 24.12.2009

AEDAS 009 Rev P9
TPM 02 Rev K
TPM 03 Rev J

Date stamped as received by the local planning authority 06.01.2010

The following documents:

AEDAS Design and Access Statement October 2009 date stamped as received by the local planning authority 03.11.2009

Flood Risk Assessment Report No. 14927-FRA01-Rev B October 2009 prepared by Gifford

Report on a bat survey at the proposed Goals Soccer centre, Heaton Park, Prestwich, Manchester October 2009 prepared by ECOtrack

Crime Impact Statement 29th May 2009 prepared by GMP 2009/0268

Pase 1 Ecological Survey dated 31st July 2009 prepared by Gifford 14927/ECO/01

Invasive Weed and Bat Survey dated 19th May 2009 prepared by Gifford 14927/ECO/02

Acoustic Report prepared by Hepworth Acoustics "Noise Assessment of Multi-sports centre Report No.20274.1v2 May 2009

Proposed Multi Sports Pitches Heaton Park - Landscape and Visual Assessment October 2009 prepared by TPM

Tree Survey Report prepared by TPM April 2008

Transport Assessment May 2009 prepared by Pinnacle Transportation ref 0806-10/PR/01

Travel Plan Framework May 2009 prepared by Pinnacle Transportation ref 0806-10/PR/02

'Security and Site Management Arrangements' date stamped as received by the local planning authority 22.12.2009

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, pursuant to policies H2.2, L1.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

4) If any lighting at the development hereby approved, when illuminated, causes glare or light spillage which in the opinion of the Council as local planning authority causes detriment to adjoining and nearby residential properties, within 14 days of a written request, a scheme for the elimination of such glare or light spillage shall be submitted to the Council as local planning authority and once approved shall thereafter be retained in accordance with details which have received prior written approval of the City Council as Local Planning Authority.

Reason - In order to minimise the impact of the illumination of the lights on the occupiers of nearby residential accommodation, pursuant to policy H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

5) Before the development hereby approved, first comes into use the acoustic mitigation measures, as set out in the submitted Acoustic Report prepared by Hepworth Acoustics "Noise Assessment of Multi-sports centre Report No.20274.1v2 May 2009" date stamped as received by the local planning authority on the 17th June 2009, shall be implemented in full and shall thereafter be retained, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - In order to protect the amenity of local residents and in accordance with Policy H2.2 in accordance with the Unitary Development plan for the City of Manchester.

6) Prior to the first use of the hereby approved development details of a Travel Plan Strategy, implementation and monitoring of effectiveness shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The strategy shall outline procedures and policies that the occupants of the site will adopt to secure the objectives of the Travel Plan Strategy. Additionally, the Travel Plan Strategy shall outline the monitoring procedures and review mechanisms that are to be put in place to ensure that the Travel Plan Strategy and its implementation remain effective. The results of the monitoring and review processes shall be submitted in writing to the local planning authority and any measures that are identified to improve the effectiveness of the Travel Plan Strategy shall be adopted and implemented.

Reason - In accordance with the provisions contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 13.

7) Prior to the hereby approved development commencing on site, details indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The boundary treatment shall be completed before first use of the Outdoor Sporting Facilities unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.

Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable to the City Council as local planning authority in the interests of the visual amenity of the area within which the site is located in order to comply with Policies H2.2, E3.3 and E3.5 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

8) Notwithstanding the approved drawings, prior to the commencement of the hereby approved development a hard and soft landscaping scheme incorporating detailed tree replacement provision, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The approved scheme; shall be implemented not later than 12 months from the date of commencement of the development hereby approved. If within a period of 5 years from the date of the planting of any tree or shrub, that tree or shrub or any tree or shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, or becomes, in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - To ensure that a satisfactory landscaping and tree replacement scheme for the development is carried out that respects the character and visual amenities of the area, in accordance with policy H2.2, E2.6 and E3.5; of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

9) No development shall commence until a scheme for the storage (including segregated waste recycling) and disposal of refuse has been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The details of the approved scheme shall be implemented as part of the development and shall remain in situ whilst the use or development is in operation.

Reason - In the interests of amenity and public health, pursuant to policy H2.2 of the adopted UDP.

10) Prior to the first use of the hereby approved development a management plan for the two car parking areas indicated on the approved plans (drawing number 009 date stamped as received by the local planning authority 3/11/09) is submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The management plan shall set out: the details of the management of the peak period parking needs of the proposal as identified within the submitted Transport Assessment prepared by Pinnacle Transportation ref 0806-10/PR/01 date stamped as received by the local planning authority on the 17th June 2009; outline the monitoring procedures and review mechanisms that are to be put in place to ensure that the management plan and its implementation remain effective. The results of the monitoring and review processes shall be submitted in writing to the local planning authority and any measures that are identified to improve the effectiveness of the management plan shall be adopted and implemented within three months of a written request to adopt an implement them. The approved management plan shall be implemented from first use of the hereby approved development and remain in operation whilst the development is in use unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason - To ensure that there is adequate car parking for the development proposed when the building is occupied in order to comply with Policies H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

11) The car parking areas indicated on the approved plans (including the reconfiguration of the existing car park to the north of the Pavilion building) shall be surfaced, demarcated and made available for use prior to first use of the Outdoor Sporting Facilities unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The car park shall then be available at all times whilst the site is occupied and shall not be used thereafter for any other purpose other than the parking of vehicles

Reason - To ensure that there is adequate parking for the development proposed when the building is occupied in order to comply with Policies H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

12) No development shall commence until details of the measures to be incorporated into the development (or phase there of) to demonstrate how secure by design accreditation will be achieved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the

City Council as LPA. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with these approved details. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied or used until the Council as LPA has acknowledged in writing that it has received written confirmation of a secure by design accreditation.

Reason - To reduce the risk of crime pursuant to Policy E3.5 of the Unitary Development Plan of the City of Manchester and to reflect the guidance contained in Planning Policy Statement 1 "Delivering Sustainable Development" and The Guide to Development Supplementary Planning Document.

13) The Outdoor Sporting Facilities of the development hereby approved shall not be open outside of the following hours:
Monday to Sunday 0900 and 2200 hrs.

Reason - To safeguard the amenity of the occupiers of nearby residential accommodation, pursuant to policy H2.2 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan.

14) The floodlights for the Outdoor Sporting Facilities shall only be switched on within the following hours:
Monday – Sunday 0900 - 2200hrs.

Reason - To minimise the impact of the floodlighting on the amenity of nearby residential properties and the wildlife found within the greenbelt. Pursuant to policies H2.2, E2.4 and DC26 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

15) Notwithstanding the hours of use set down for the floodlights in condition 14, the floodlights to the Outdoor Sporting Facilities shall be switched off unless the Outdoor Sporting Facility is in use or they are required to be switched on for the purpose of maintenance.

Reason - To keep the impact of the floodlighting on the amenity of the occupiers of nearby residential accommodation to a minimum and reduce any impact of the lighting on foraging Bats pursuant to policies H2.2 and E2.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

16) a) Before the development hereby approved commences, a report (the Preliminary Risk Assessment) to identify and evaluate all potential sources and impacts of any ground contamination, groundwater contamination and/or ground gas relevant to the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The Preliminary Risk Assessment shall conform to City Council's current guidance document (Planning Guidance in Relation to Ground Contamination).

In the event of the Preliminary Risk Assessment identifying risks which in the written opinion of the Local Planning Authority require further investigation, the development shall not commence until a scheme for the investigation of the site and the identification of remediation measures (the Site Investigation Proposal) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

The measures for investigating the site identified in the Site Investigation Proposal shall be carried out, before the development commences and a report prepared outlining what measures, if any, are required to remediate the land (the Site Investigation Report and/or Remediation Strategy) which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

b) When the development commences, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the previously agreed Remediation Strategy and a Completion/Verification Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

In the event that ground contamination, groundwater contamination and/or ground gas, not previously identified, are found to be present on the site at any time before the development is occupied, then development shall cease and/or the development shall not be occupied until, a report outlining what measures, if any, are required to remediate the land (the Revised Remediation Strategy) is submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the Revised Remediation Strategy, which shall take precedence over any Remediation Strategy or earlier Revised Remediation Strategy.

Reason - To ensure that the presence of or the potential for any contaminated land and/or groundwater is detected and appropriate remedial action is taken in the interests of public safety, pursuant to E3.5 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

17) Prior to the commencement of development a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and the Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Gifford Rev B dated 09/10/2009, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be subsequently implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

The scheme shall also include:

Details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed after completion.

Reason - To prevent flooding by ensuring satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water pursuant to policy DC21.1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and national Planning Policy Statement 25.

18) In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree, shrub or hedge which is to be as shown as retained on the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of 5 years from the date of the occupation of the building for its permitted use.

(a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the local planning authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 5387 (Trees in relation to construction)

(b) If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.

(c) The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and particulars before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the local planning authority.

Reason - In order avoid damage to trees/shrubs adjacent to and within the site, which are of important amenity value to the area and in order to protect the character of the area, in accordance with Policies E2.4 and E2.6 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

19) The Pavilion shall only be used as an Essential Facility.

Reason – As any non-essential use of the Pavilion building would be contrary to national policy contained within PPG2 and policy E2.1 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

20) The Pavilion shall not be open outside of the following hours:
Monday –to Sunday 0900 – 2230.

Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the City Council as Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To protect the amenity of the occupiers of nearby residential properties pursuant to policies H2.2 and DC26 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

21) Prior to the commencement of development full details of the specification and construction of the proposed netball/tennis courts shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The netball/tennis courts shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason – To ensure that the appropriate surfacing is used for the proposed sports use pursuant to policy L1.2 and L1.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

22) Prior to the commencement of development details of a phasing and management scheme of construction works shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The Phasing and Management scheme should include the details of how access and availability of the adjacent bowling greens and Pavilion shall be maintained during construction works. The Construction works shall be undertaken in accordance with the agreed phasing and

management scheme unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason – To ensure that access and availability of the adjacent bowling greens is maintained during construction works pursuant to policy L1.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

23) Prior to the first use of the hereby approved development a Community Use scheme for the Outdoor Sporting Facilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The approved scheme shall include: details of hours of free use by local schools and other community groups (hours available for use free of financial charge shall amount to 60% of the time the facilities are open); details of those facilities available for free use; management responsibilities; and, shall include a mechanism for review of groups and users able to use the facilities free of any financial charge. The approved scheme shall be implemented upon first use of the development and shall remain in place whilst the use or development is in operation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason - To secure well managed safe community access to sports facilities, to ensure benefit to the development of sport pursuant to policies L1.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

23) Before the development hereby approved commences any externally mounted ancillary equipment, shall be acoustically insulated in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The scheme shall secure a reduction in the level of noise emanating from the development to achieve a noise level of 5 db below the existing background (LA90) in each octave band at the nearest noise sensitive location.

Reason – To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential accommodation from associated comings and goings, pursuant to policy H2.2 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan.

24) The development hereby approved shall include a building lighting scheme and a scheme for the illumination of external areas during the period between dusk and dawn, or as may be otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. Full details of such a scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the development commences. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full before the development is first occupied unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority and shall remain in operation for so long as the development is occupied.

Reason - In the interests of amenity, crime reduction and the personal safety of those using the proposed development in order to comply with the requirements of government guidance in Planning Policy Statement 1 and Policies H2.2, E3.3 and E3.5 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

25) The development hereby approved shall achieve a post-construction Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) rating of at

least 'very good'. A post construction review certificate shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority before any of the buildings hereby approved are first occupied. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority

Reason - In order to minimise the environmental impact of the development pursuant to policies E1.5 and E1.6 in the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, and the principles contained within The Guide to Development in Manchester 2 SPD and national Planning Policy Statement 1.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

The documents referred to in the course of this report are either contained in the file(s) relating to application ref: 090370/FO/2009/N1 held by Planning or are City Council planning policies, the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, national planning guidance documents, or relevant decisions on other applications or appeals, copies of which are all held by the Planning Division.

Equal Opportunities

The proposal will be directly accessible to all members of the public, including those with mobility impairments.

Environmental Improvements

The proposal includes the provision of energy efficiency measures and will incorporate sustainable drainage measures to deal with surface water run off.

HEAD OF PLANNING