

Application Number	Date of Appln	Committee Date	Ward
086879/FO/2008/S2	10 th Sep 2009	19 th Nov 2009	Woodhouse Park Ward

Proposal Erection of one air freight transit unit (18,238sqm of floorspace) and the re-alignment and upgrade of Avro Way/Runger Lane, together with associated car parking, landscaping and ancillary works

Location Land Adjacent To Runger Lane, Woodhouse Park, Manchester.

Applicant Manchester Airport Developments Ltd , C/o Agent

Agent White Young Green, Regatta House, Clippers Quay, Salford Quays, Manchester, M50 3XP

Both this planning application and accompanying listed building consent application to demolish Rose Cottage were placed before the Wythenshawe Area Committee on 25th September 2008. At that meeting the committee resolved that both applications be referred to the Planning and Highways Committee with a recommendation that the Wythenshawe Area Committee recommend refusal of the applications on the grounds that

- applicant had not sufficiently justified the economic benefits of the expansion of the cargo facilities,
- the applicant had not sufficiently justified the economic benefits of the expansion of the cargo facilities to justify the loss of the listed building.

Since the September 2008 meeting of the Wythenshawe Area Committee the applicants have re-evaluated their current operational requirements and have amended the proposal to that now placed before the committee. The major changes to the scheme are that only one transit shed is now proposed and Rose Cottage is to be retained. Given the latter, the applicants have withdrawn their Listed Building Consent application (ref. 086880/LO/2008/S2).

Given the major changes to the proposal the application was again placed before the Wythenshawe Area Committee at it's meeting on 22nd October 2009. At that meeting the committee recommended that the application be refused for the following reasons and referred to the next available Planning and Highways Committee for their deliberation:

- impact on the residential amenity of those residents living near to the scheme;
- impact on the environment;
- the economic benefits of the development had not been justified.

Description

The application site is 9½ hectares (23½ acres) in size and is located between the World Freight Terminal on Avro Way and the M56 motorway. The site is located within the boundaries of the Green Belt and also the Airport Operational Area, it is also classified as being part of a Major Development Site within the Green Belt as defined by the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) for the City of Manchester.

The site is bounded by the M56 motorway to the north-west, airport car parking to the north-east, the runway apron and World Freight Terminal to the east and south and hotel developments to the south-west. Runger Lane lies to the east of the application site, forming the boundary between the site and the World Freight Terminal. Hasty Lane, a minor road severed except for a pedestrian subway by the M56 motorway, is located in the northern half of the site and runs through to neighbouring Trafford.

The majority of the site consists of semi-natural habitat, within which lies a pond. However, in the northern half of the site, off Hasty Lane, there are five dwellinghouses, one of which, Rose Cottage, a 17th century dwellinghouse with a number of 20th century alterations and additions. In addition to the dwellinghouses, a former off-airport car parking depot is also situated off Hasty Lane.

The applicants are proposing to erect one industrial units (Class B8 – storage/distribution) to form transit sheds for the processing of air freight. The unit A would be located adjacent to the existing World Freight Terminal and would be two to three storeys in height, comprising of 18,238m² of gross floorspace, approximately 20% of which would be ancillary office accommodation. The unit would have *airside* and *landside* service yards. Air freight arriving in Manchester Airport would enter the transit sheds via the *airside* service yards and then be sorted for distribution throughout the region and elsewhere in the UK. Freight would then be transported to the highway network via the *landside* service yards. The process would be reversed for road freight bound for distribution by air. 151 parking spaces are proposed within the *landside* service yard of the unit.

The applicants are also proposing to realign Runger Lane/Avro Way from its junction with Avro Way towards Thorley Lane. The realigned road would be a dual carriageway which would then link in with the existing single carriageway on Thorley Lane. To facilitate this 2 of the 5 dwellinghouses on Hasty Lane, along with an element of the vacant depot would be demolished. Originally the applicants proposed to create a new access road linking Hasty Lane to the realigned Runger Lane/Avro Way. However, as concern was raised about the impact this road would have upon the setting of the listed building the scheme was duly amended and instead they are now proposing a new junction between Hasty Lane and the realigned Runger Lane/Avro Way.

Originally the applicants proposed to erect two industrial units (18,238m² and 4,587m² of Class B8 accommodation) on this site to form transit sheds for the processing of air freight. As that proposal would have required the demolition of Rose Cottage, a Grade II listed building, a listed building consent application (ref. 086880/LO/2008/S2) was also submitted by the applicant.

Consultations and Notifications

Local Residents/Businesses – Following notification of the revised proposal, an online petition of 1026 signatures has been received objecting to the scheme, the main points of objection are:

- Nearby is a 300 year old pond hosting a colony of great crested newts.
- The area is surrounded by dozens of mature trees and beautifully preserved and balanced ecology.
- The site is an environmental and historical oasis in the midst of heavy modern industry.

In addition to the above, objection letters have been received from two households, two of which are on Hasty Lane. Their objection is that the whole argument for this development is flawed and the figures to justify it are out of date. With the change in the Airport's passenger numbers and the whole aviation industries downturn in recent times due to the world economic situation, there is no justification for the extra commercial unit.

The signatories to the petition and the two households have also objected to the demolition of Rose Cottage. However, as the listed building consent application has been withdrawn those particular points of objections are no longer of relevance.

Councillor Eakins – Since this application was minded to be refused last year Manchester Airport has suffered acutely during the recession as air freight has dropped significantly, to approximately half the November 2007 peak

This application will nearly double air freight capacity at Manchester Airport. The question I have is; as we clearly don't need to double capacity now, would we need to do so in the future?

According to the Department of Energy and Climate Change, Parliament passed enforceable legislation to reduce aviation emissions to 95% of their 2005 levels by 2012. If airlines went beyond their allocated limit, they could purchase carbon credits through the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS).

Long term, however, the UK has set a goal of not exceeding 2005 emission levels, regardless of ETS - in other words, airlines would eventually be prevented from purchasing credits that would exceed their allocation. Even this ambition may be strengthened, depending on the Copenhagen summit and the conclusions of the UK Climate Change Committee December report.

Air freight is still in 'negative growth', and has been since May 2008 - how long will it take Manchester Airport to recover to Nov 2007 levels? Even if air freight made a strong recovery, it would need to be kept below the 2005 levels by 2012, unless airlines purchase increasingly expensive credits. Even this is not sustainable, as extra credits will become prohibitively expensive, and eventually prohibited by law. How can the airport justify doubling the 2007 capacity when they know they won't even be able to sustain a recovery beyond the 2005 levels?

In short, we don't need to double air freight capacity now, and if we did, the capacity would simply lay empty in the future due to existing legislation. The economic case has not been made, and I urge the Committee to save the Airport the £20m it wants to waste, and reject this application.

Head of Highway Services – No objections to the revised highway layout.

Head of Environmental Health – Suggests the imposition of a noise insulation and ground contamination conditions to protect levels of residential amenity.

Environmental Services – There are no individual trees of any significance on the site, though the boundary trees as a hedge should be retained if possible.

Wythenshawe Regeneration Team – No objections in principle.

Greater Manchester Police (GMP) – Supports the application subject to the developer following the recommendations contained within the Crime Impact Statement.

Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive (GMPTE) – Runger Lane is an existing bus route and two existing bus stops on Runger Lane would be removed by the re-alignment of the carriageway but none of the proposed drawings show the location of new bus stops on the new section of Avro Way. Ideally GMPTE would want the new carriageway to be designed to incorporate bus services with provision for buses to stop safely and two bus stops (one in each direction) to be located near to the pedestrian entrance to the site.

Greater Manchester Archaeology Unit (GMAU) – The application as revised no longer proposes any development activity in the plots within which Rose Cottage and the other buildings along Hasty Lane stand. It would seem that there is no longer a direct threat to any known or suspected archaeological interest. Consequently GMAU considers there are no longer any grounds for seeking to impose an archaeological requirement upon the applicant.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) – The development will result in the loss of a pond that currently supports a population of great crested newts. As a result, before planning permission can be granted the following three tests from the European Habitats Directive and the Conservation (Nature Habitats and Conservation) Regulations 1994 must be satisfied:

- 1) That the development is "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 consequence of primary for environment.
- 2) That there is "no satisfactory alternative".
- 3) That the derogation is "not detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range".

GMEU have also made the following comments:

- It is recommended that further bat surveys are undertaken on a number of the properties on Hasty Lane. As bats are also a protected species the three tests described above must also be considered.
- With the exception of the great crested newt breeding pond none of the semi-natural habitats identified on the application site is of substantive nature conservation importance.
- The proposals put forward in the amphibian mitigation strategy and the landscape plan submitted as part of the application offer sufficient compensation for lost habitat areas, though a survey of the ponds at the receptor site on Wilkins Lane should be undertaken to ensure that newts have previously colonised these ponds.
- Any vegetation clearance required by the development must take place outside of the optimum period for bird nesting (March to July inclusive) unless nesting birds have been shown to be absent.

Natural England – Natural England are not aware of any nationally designated landscapes or any statutorily designated areas of nature conservation importance that

would be significantly affected by the proposed planning application. They state further that they are satisfied that the proposal does not have any significant impacts upon Natural England's other interests, including National Trails, Access Land, or the areas of search for new national landscape designations.

They are disappointed that the aquatic and terrestrial habitat for Newts, which has been used in mitigation for previous development activity, is now to be lost. It would be the case with many habitat types that this type of loss would be considered unacceptable. However, in light of the fact that they consider habitat of this quality can quite quickly be developed and in light of the mitigation proposed in this case, which includes gains in net habitat provision, they do not object to the development on these grounds.

Natural England recommend that all habitat and species mitigation measures proposed within the Environmental Statement are made into formal conditions within any granting of permission for the proposed development and that further measures are considered to ensure management and protection of new habitats created.

North West Regional Assembly (NWRA) – As the plans for the transit units have been reduced in size this application still generally conforms to RSS Policies RT5 and RT7.

English Heritage – Welcome the recognition of the need to retain the listed cottage as an important heritage asset. However, the full impact of the proposed development still needs to be considered, to identify and moderate its potential impact on the setting of the listed building group.

It is therefore recommended that the site layout should be redesigned so that the spur access from Avro Way is removed from the proposal and the site edge appropriately landscaped. This would retain the existing access along Hasty Lane and the junction of Runger Lane, enhancing the landscaped edge of the former pastoral land, and go some way to mitigate the impact of the proposed development.

Highways Agency – No objections to the proposal being granted consent as the transit units would result in minimal impact on the strategic highway network.

Environment Agency – No objection in principle to the proposed development subject to the imposition of conditions designed to reduce risk of flooding and water pollution.

Aerodrome Safeguarding Officer – No safeguarding objections subject to the imposition of conditions designed to ensure the safe operation of aircraft.

Trafford Borough Council – The neighbouring local authority has no comments to make.

The Ramblers' Association – Object to the proposal for the following reasons:

- The proposal is contrary to the guidance contained within PPG2.
- The proposal would have a detrimental impact upon wildlife, some of which are designated as protected species.
- There will be a disruption to the rights of way network, primarily the loss of the subway underneath the M56 and the footpath running on Runger Lane.

- The footpath adjacent to the realigned road will not be screened from the new road.

Stop Expansion at Manchester Airport Coalition (SEMA) – Object to the proposal on the grounds that the arguments put forward by the airport for expanding the freight terminal stem from bad economics. By their own admission, Manchester Airport have stated that freight figures are down by 14.54% and they expect this downturn to continue. Manchester Airport promise to create 60 jobs from this development; that is 60 jobs which SEMA believe are neither secure nor sustainable. It is also felt that 60 jobs are remarkably few for a 9 hectare site.

Issues

Unitary Development Plan (UDP) – The following UDP policies are relevant in this instance:

Policy H2.2 – States that the Council will not normally allow development which will have an unacceptable impact on residential areas. The matters which the City 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.

Policy EW20 – The future expansion of, and future development at, Manchester Airport will take place within the Airport Operational Area, the boundary of which is defined on the proposals map.

Policy EW21 – A 'Major Developed Site' within the Green Belt has been identified at Manchester Airport and its boundary is shown on the Proposals Map. Infilling and re-development within the boundary of this site will be treated as appropriate development providing it meets the tests set out in Annex C of PPG2 and is in line with the developments and uses listed within this policies reason, of which cargo handling facilities is one, which are necessary for the operational efficiency and amenity of the Airport.

Airport development proposals which do not meet the above infilling or redevelopment criteria, but are in accord with the uses set out in the Policy Reason, will be subject to the test of very special circumstances as referenced in Part 1 Policy E2.1. The location of such Airport development proposals within the Major Developed Site will be a material consideration in determining whether very special circumstances exist. It must be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the City Council that it is essential to the operational efficiency and amenity of the Airport that such development is located within the Major Developed Site and not outside of the Site. It must also be demonstrated that such development will assist in enhancing the economic vitality of the Region.

Policy EW24 – The City Council will seek to ensure that a high standard of landscaping is provided throughout the Airport Operational Area.

Policy EW25 – In considering applications for development within the Airport Operational Area, the City Council will require a high standard of design which reflects the prestigious nature of an international gateway Airport and its location with and adjacent to the Greater Manchester Green Belt.

Policy E2.1 – Within the Green Belt planning permission will not be granted, except

in very special circumstances, for the construction of new buildings for purposes other than agriculture, forestry, essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor 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.

In all instances the City 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.

Policy E2.3 – The City Council will protect important wildlife habitats, and where appropriate, will designate areas as local nature reserves.

In all instances the City 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.

Policy T4 – States that in dealing with all proposals connected with the Airport, the City Council will continue to pursue its present policy of seeking to promote its development in a way which is environmentally a sensitive.

DC16 – States that in considering development proposals for any site, the retention of existing trees and the planting of new trees within the public highway and along the public frontages of the site will be encouraged by the City Council.

DC19 – States that in determining applications for development involving or having an impact on listed buildings, the City Council will have regard to the desirability of securing the retention, restoration, maintenance and continued use of such buildings and to protecting their general setting.

Wythenshawe Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) – Approved in December 2004, the SRF includes a number of policies related to the airport, the most relevant of which in this instance are:

Policy ED1 -to support the continued growth of Manchester Airport and Wythenshawe, as one of the UK's premier business locations, capable of attracting corporate end users on an international scale to the conurbation.

North West of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) to 2021 (adopted September 2008) – The following policies are considered of relevance in this instance:

Policy EM 1 (Integrated Enhancement and Protection of the Region's Environmental Assets) – The Region's environmental assets should be identified, protected, enhanced and managed. Plans, strategies, proposals and schemes should deliver an integrated approach to conserving and enhancing the landscape, natural environment, historic environment and woodlands of the region.

Policy RT5 (Airports) – States that plans and strategies should support economic activity generated and sustained by the Region's airports, in particular the importance of Manchester Airport as a key economic driver for the North of England. Furthermore, in formulating plans and strategies, account should be taken of the contribution general aviation makes to the regional and local economies.

The policy also states that the future operational and infrastructure requirements, surface access demands and environmental impacts for the airport should be identified in airport master plans and other relevant plans and strategies, based on the strategic framework for the development of airport capacity set out in the White Paper "Future of Air Transport".

In addition, the policy states that in considering applications for development at airports, account will be taken of:

- the extent to which surface access and car parking arrangements encourage the use of public transport, walking and cycling;
- the effect of the proposed development on noise and atmospheric pollution, and the extent to which this can be mitigated;
- the effect of the proposed development on the health and well being of local communities; and
- the adverse effects on sites of national and international nature conservation importance to ensure that these effects are avoided, mitigated or compensated as appropriate.

Policy RT7 (Freight Transport) – States that Local authorities should work with airport operators to facilitate the development of air freight at the region's airports, in line with the White Paper 'The Future of Air Transport', having particular regard to the need to minimise and mitigate environmental impacts (including night noise).'

Policy MCR1 (Manchester City Region Priorities) – States that plans and strategies in the Manchester City Region should

- support interventions necessary to achieve a significant improvement in the sub-region's economic performance by encouraging investment and sustainable development in the Regional Centre, surrounding inner areas, the towns/cities and other key locations in order to contribute to the growth opportunities
- maintain the role of Manchester Airport as the North of England's key international gateway in line with Policy RT5.

Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS 1 "Delivering Sustainable Development") – PPS1 states that planning proposals should be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The guidance continues highlighting the importance of locating development at suitable locations to ensure the economic prosperity.

Planning Policy Guidance 2 (PPG2 "Green Belts") – PPG2 sets out five purposes for the inclusion of land within the greenbelt, namely to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; to assist and safeguard the countryside from encroachment; to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other open land.

PPG2 states that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development and that such development should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and 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.

The PPG states further that Green Belts contain major developed sites in continuing use such as civil airfields and that these sites remain subject to development control policies for Green Belts and that the Green Belt notation should be carried across them. If a major developed site is specifically identified for the purposes of Annex C (Future Of Major Developed Sites In The Green Belt) in the UDP, infilling or redevelopment which meets specific criteria is not inappropriate development. It should be noted that policy EW21 in the UDP has identified Manchester Airport as a 'Major Developed Site' within the Green Belt.

The PPG states in Annexe C that limited infilling at major developed sites in continuing use may help to secure jobs and prosperity without further prejudicing the Green Belt. Where this is so, local planning authorities may in their development plans identify the site, defining the boundary of the present extent of development and setting out a policy for limited infilling for the continuing use within this boundary. Such infilling should:

- have no greater impact on the purposes of including land in the Green Belt than the existing development;
- not exceed the height of the existing buildings; and
- not lead to a major increase in the developed proportion of the site.

Planning Policy Statement 9 (PPS9, "Biodiversity and Geological Conservation") – PPS9 (para 1[vi]) states that the aim of planning decisions should be to prevent harm to biodiversity and geological conservation interests. Where granting planning permission would result in significant harm to those interests, local planning authorities will need to be satisfied that the development cannot reasonably be located on any alternative sites that would result in less or no harm. In the absence of any such alternatives, local planning authorities should ensure that, before planning permission is granted, adequate mitigation measures are put in place. Where a planning decision would result in significant harm to biodiversity and geological interests which cannot be prevented or adequately mitigated against, appropriate compensation measures should be sought. If that significant harm cannot be prevented, adequately mitigated against, or compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.

Furthermore, paragraph 16 states that planning authorities should ensure that species such as Great Crested Newts are protected from the adverse effects of development, where appropriate, by using planning conditions or obligations.

Planning Policy Guidance 13 (PPG13, "Transport") – In Annex B: Planning for Transport it states the guidance acknowledges that airports have become major transport interchanges and traffic generators, and attract a range of related and non-related developments. It states further that in preparing their development plans and in determining planning applications local planning authorities should consider the extent to which development is related to the operation of the airport, and is sustainable given the prevailing and planned levels of public transport. In this respect:

- the operational needs of the airport includes runway and terminal facilities, aircraft maintenance and handling provision, and warehousing and distribution services related to goods passing through the airport;
- related development appropriate to airports includes transport interchanges,

administrative offices, short and long stay parking;

- less directly related development includes hotels, conference and leisure facilities, offices and retail. For such activities, the relationship to the airport related business should be explicitly justified, be of an appropriate scale relative to core airport related business and be assessed against relevant policy elsewhere in planning policy guidance; and
- non-related development which should be assessed against relevant policy elsewhere in the planning guidance.

Planning Policy Guidance 15 (PPG15, "Planning and the Historic Environment") – PPG15 (para2.16) states that there is a requirement for local authorities considering applications for planning permission for works which affect a listed building to have special regard to certain matters, including the desirability of preserving the setting of the building.

In addition, paragraph 5.5 states that wherever possible, new roads should be kept away from listed buildings. However, in each case a suitable balance has to be struck between conservation, other environmental concerns, economics, safety and engineering feasibility.

The Northern Way – The Northern Way is an inter-regional growth strategy seeking a step change in the way in which the regional development is approached and providing an innovative joined-up approach to economic development and sustainable communities. The Northern Way covers the three regions of the North West, North East and Yorkshire and Humberside. It acknowledges the importance of regional airports especially Manchester, the largest airport outside London.

The City Region Development Programme (CRDP) – The Manchester CRDP forms part of the Northern Way and specifically sets out how the Manchester City Region will contribute to the economic development referred to in the interregional growth strategy.

The Manchester CRDP, with specific reference to development capacity at Manchester Airport, advocates that regional agencies are to support medium and long term planning of capacity for freight, logistics, commercial and industrial development, hotels and airport services.

Manchester Airport Master Plan to 2030 – The Master Plan was published in October 2007 and sets out the Airport's strategy to 2030. Airport Master Plans have no formal statutory status, but they set out how the national policy contained in the White Paper can be implemented at a local level. The Government has indicated that it expects them to be taken into account in the preparation of regional and local policies and in the making of planning decisions.

Chapter 7 of the Master Plan sets out the Airport's Economic Objectives, which includes bringing forward development and investment opportunities that increase economic activity.

Alongside the Master Plan sit four Action Plans (Ground Transport Plan, Environment Plan, Land Use Plan and Community Plan), which were also published in October 2007. The most relevant of these to the application proposal, the Land Use Plan, is considered below.

The Land Use Plan states that a number of uses will require direct access to the

airfield and the terminals and that they will be directed towards appropriate locations within the Operational Area. It states further that safety and security, and the needs of customers, are also key considerations when identifying land uses and airport activity.

With specific regard to transit unit accommodation, the Land Use Plan states that:

‘On the basis of forecast cargo business and the capacity of the existing units, additional Transit Shed capacity will be required before 2015. Land will be reserved for redevelopment before 2015. Land will be reserved for redevelopment and extension of the World Freight Terminal. By 2015 around 9 hectares of land will be required for Transit Shed facilities. This will increase to around 11 hectares by 2030.’

Principle of Development in the Green Belt – The principle of a development of this nature in this Green Belt location has already been established with the approval of the three hotels on the adjacent sites. Notwithstanding this, the development must still be tested against the guidance contained within PPG2 and against the relevant UDP policies.

The application site is within a major developed site within the Green Belt. Policy EW21, supported by PPG 2, states that development which is either infilling or redevelopment is considered to be appropriate within a major developed site in the greenbelt, provided it meets certain tests.

The application site is greenfield, therefore this proposal cannot be considered to be for redevelopment. To be considered infilling, the proposal would have to constitute "the filling of small gaps between built development" (annexe C2 PPG2). Given that the site is now completely enclosed by development or proposed development, i.e. the three hotels to the south, the M56 motorway to the west, airport car parking to the north and the Terminal 2 apron and existing World Freight Terminal to the east, it is considered that the development constitutes limited infilling in the Green Belt. In light of this, the following tests from Annexe C in PPG2 need to be considered:

1. the development shall have no greater impact on the purposes of including land in the Green Belt than the existing development;
2. the development shall not exceed the height of the existing buildings; and
3. the development shall not lead to a major increase in the developed proportion of the site.

It is considered that the application meets all three of these tests:

The site is within the Airport Operational Area and is wholly surrounded by built development. The proposal will ‘infill’ a site which has long since been identified as being appropriate and allocated for airport-related development and will not result in a piecemeal extension to the existing south Manchester conurbation. Furthermore, the scale of the development will not be any greater than existing buildings in the surrounding area, including the adjacent hotels which are currently under construction. Finally, the application site equates to just 1.5% of the overall Airport Operational Area, the development will therefore not lead to a major increase in the developed proportion of the site.

Operational Need for the Proposal – The forecast growth and development of Manchester Airport is set out in their masterplan. It estimates that Manchester Airport will be handling in the region of 250,000 tonnes of air cargo by 2015 and that the employment and economic impact will grow to between 59,290 and 61,430 full time jobs and £1.6 billion of income across the North West region by the same year.

The current transit units provide approximately 27,400m² of lettable floorspace, which equates to an annual efficiency approaching 6 tonnes of cargo processed per square metre. At present the existing transit units at Manchester Airport are all fully occupied and are operating close to capacity. As the amount of cargo arriving at Manchester Airport increases then the amount of cargo processed per square metres needs to be increased. In order to do this efficiently the applicants state that they require a modern and up-to-date transit unit in order to process the cargo before it is then warehoused in the World Freight Terminal. The existing units do not offer the unit depths and eaves heights required to meet operators' needs and there is a very real danger of business being lost to the region through the use of other airports which benefit from more modern facilities.

In order for the Airport to compete and for it to retain or expand its market share, it is necessary to provide a more highly mechanised unit providing additional floorspace to allow existing operators to expand and to accommodate new operators who have indicated that they wish to establish a presence at the Airport. A unit with a high degree of mechanisation can effectively act as a 'sorting machine' from aircraft to road, where the building goes from empty to full to empty again within a period of 12 hours or less. It is this operation which allows productivity rates to reach levels as high as 8 to 10 tonnes per square metre.

Although it is acknowledged that recent economic conditions have had a temporary impact on the airport's freight business, there are real signs that a recovery has begun and it is considered that the level of projected growth cited above is still accurate. Accordingly, in order to respond to the consistent and sustained growth that the industry has been characterised by, and in order to benefit the region as a whole, it is considered necessary that additional freight capacity is put in place in order for the Airport and the region to respond quickly to future growth in the economy.

Impact Upon Protected Species/Nature Conservation – As Great Crested Newts, which are known to occupy a pond within the application site, are a European protected species under the European Habitats Directive and the Conservation (Nature Habitats and Conservation) Regulations 1994, the following three tests from those regulations must be satisfied before planning consent can be granted:

1. That the development is "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 consequence of primary for environment.
2. That there is "no satisfactory alternative".
3. That the derogation is "not detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range".

The tests are addressed below:

1. The applicants have provided sufficient information to show that the overriding public interest of the proposed development lies in its contribution to the economic health of Manchester Airport and the consequent effect in enhancing the economic vitality of the region.
2. Given the security and logistical requirements of the proposal, i.e. the need to have a clearly segregated *airside* and *landside* and be next to the existing cargo facilities, the locational requirements of the proposed transit shed are restrictive and limit where it can be sited. The only location available which meets these requirements is the current application site. It is able to provide segregated *airside* and *landside* service areas and is located adjacent to the World Freight Terminal. It is not considered that there is a satisfactory alternative to the application site.
3. There is a well established purpose-built newt receptor site (Wilkins Lane) in the vicinity of the site which is capable of re-homing any great crested newts found on the site and additional aquatic habitats are proposed on a habitat site on Altrincham Road. The Wilkins Lane site is currently unused and as it is between 400 to 500 metres away from the nearest known great crested newt pond it is at a distance that may slow natural colonisation, thereby maximising the carrying capacity for the translocated population from the application site. These replacement aquatic habitats, measuring 0.1 hectares (0.25 acres) and consisting of four ponds and an interconnecting ditch, are considered to be sufficient replacements for the 0.04 hectares (0.09 acres) proposed to be lost as part of the proposal. It is considered that the provision of the existing receptor site and the proposed replacement habitat will help maintain the population levels of these protected species.

Regarding the presence of bats, surveys undertaken in March 2008 did not find any evidence of them residing in any of the existing buildings on the site. In addition, studies of 16 trees considered as potential roosts for bats where also examined and no evidence of habitation was found. Given this, it is not considered appropriate to request that further bat surveys are undertaken prior to construction.

Given the above, and the fact that GMEU consider that the proposals put forward in the amphibian mitigation strategy and the landscape plan offer sufficient compensation for lost habitat areas, the impact upon protected species is considered minimal.

Impact on the Visual Amenities of the Green Belt – PPG2 states that the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. Whilst the proposed development site is indisputably currently 'open' in the sense that it is not built upon, it has little sense of 'openness'. The parcel of land within which the site is located is almost entirely surrounded by development, i.e. the three hotels to the south, the M56 motorway to the west, airport car parking to the north and the Terminal 2 apron and existing World Freight Terminal to the east. It has no visual connections to the countryside to the south or northwest and physical connections to the countryside involve crossing either a major road junction or crossing beneath a motorway. It is believed that the site provides neither a tranquil nor a high visual amenity environment/buffer between the World Freight Terminal and

the settlement of Hale to the west.

Though the development would result in a moderately adverse impact upon the few close views into the site, primarily those from footpaths around the site, it is considered that tree planting in and around the site can, in the longer term, help to screen such views and break up the extent of frontage visible.

Opportunities for distant views of the development are relatively limited, due to the nature of the topography and enclosure by new development, settlement and vegetation. In distant views from the wider area, the transit sheds would appear adjacent to and within the context of other development of a similar scale. Views from distant viewpoints are mostly panoramic, meaning that a new structure would form a small component of the overall view. Views would be partially screened, with only upper elements visible.

Though the construction of the transit sheds will inevitably impact upon this particular element of the Green Belt, given this site's location and the surrounding land uses and topography, it is not considered that the proposal will have a detrimental impact upon the visual amenities of the Green Belt as a whole.

Access for Disabled People – Though the final fit-out of the transit unit has yet to be agreed with end users it is anticipated that level access into the transit unit will be provided, along with w.c. and parking facilities dedicated for use by disabled people.

Design – The transit unit will be constructed from a variety of cladding systems and will include full height glazing and canopies in the office elements. Given this, and the fact that the appearance of the roof has been reduced by the use of hipped elements and shallow pitches, it is considered that the design of the proposal is good quality architecture and represents a significant improvement upon the existing World Freight Terminal.

Scale and Massing – The transit unit would be approximately 12 metres (39 feet) in height which is comparable to the existing World Freight Terminal and smaller than the adjoining hotel development. Furthermore, the massing of the building has been broken up by the use of hipped and shallow pitched roofs along with the use of contrasting materials and glazing in the office elements of each building.

Overall, the scale and massing of the transit unit is felt to be appropriate to the location.

Siting – The orientation of the proposed transit unit is governed by the location of the airport apron and existing access to the adjoining cargo area, along with the need for segregated *airside* and *landside* loading areas. Notwithstanding this, the proposed unit has been sited in such a way that the office element would front the proposed realigned Runger Lane with servicing areas on either side. Despite the constraints of the site and the logistical and security requirements of the proposal the siting of the proposed unit is considered acceptable.

Residential Amenity – Though two dwellings would remain on Hasty Lane following the realignment of Runger Lane/Avro Way it is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the existing levels of residential amenity enjoyed by the residents of those properties due to the retention of the landscaping between Hasty Lane and the proposed transit shed.

Highways Considerations – The second phase of Terminal 2 was conditional upon upgrades to the road link between Terminal 2 and Junction 6 of the M56 motorway. The approval of Runway 2 was also conditional upon the provision of a similar upgraded road link when pre-determined levels of passenger throughput were achieved. Though the Terminal 2 and Runway 2 road schemes were on different alignments to the realignment now proposed as part of this application, it is acknowledged that this section of Runger Lane will form part of this upgraded road link. Furthermore, it is recognised that moving this new access road to the edge of the site will make the most efficient use of land within the Airport Operational Area.

The proposed junction of Hasty Lane with the realignment of Runger Lane/Avro Way is considered to be acceptable.

Impact upon the Listed Building – To minimise the impact of the development upon Rose Cottage the applicants have amended the scheme by removing the proposed access road that was to have been built off the realigned Runger Lane/Avro Way. Given these amendments to the highway layout, the fact that the transit shed would be located approximately 42 metres (138 feet) away from Rose Cottage and a strip of landscaping would be retained between the two buildings, it is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the setting of this listed building.

Travel Plan – The applicants are proposing to incorporate the proposed transit unit into their existing travel plan arrangements. An appropriate condition is suggested to ensure that this is the case.

Parking Spaces – The proposed level of staff parking, i.e. 151 spaces, is considered acceptable.

Landscaping – The loss of the existing trees and hedging is regrettable. However, the proposed indicative landscaping scheme shows considerable perimeter planting between the proposed transit shed and the realigned Runger Lane and between this new road and the M56 motorway. It is believed that this planting, in line with the City Council's Tree Strategy, will result in a net gain in tree coverage for the site. Furthermore, once established it is understood that this planting will screen the proposal from the public highway.

A condition requiring the submission of a detailed landscaping plan will be attached to any approval granted.

BREEAM – The supporting documentation submitted by the applicants suggests that the development would achieve a BREEAM rating of "very good". A condition will be attached requiring that this rating is achieved at the post construction stage.

Renewable Energy – A feasibility study has considered the viability of various renewable and low energy solutions for this development. It concluded that a biomass boiler would be the most suitable option for the site and as a result the applicants have incorporated one into their scheme. In addition to this, consideration will also be given to minimising direct solar gain to avoid the need for air-conditioning, maximising natural ventilation, the use of energy efficient heating and lighting systems and minimising the embodied energy of construction materials.

In addition to the biomass boiler, water conservation techniques will also be incorporated into the buildings, e.g. low flush w.c. facilities and water conserving

tap design and controls), with consideration also being given to rainwater harvesting.

Water Run-off – Concern about the level of water run-off from the site was raised at the previous Wythenshawe Area Committee meeting.

The applicants have stated that the increase in surface water run-off from the hard surfaced areas and the buildings will require a drainage system to be implemented which will include appropriate sustainable urban drainage systems and other attenuation systems. Though ground investigations in the vicinity have indicated that infiltration systems may not be suitable the applicants have confirmed that the surface water drainage system should incorporate trapped gullies with an overall capacity compatible with the development site to prevent pollution.

Crime and Disorder – No objections were raised by GMP, subject to the applicant following the recommendations contained within the Crime Impact Statement. A condition is suggested in this instance which will require the applicant to obtain Secured by Design accreditation, this will ensure the recommendations contained within the Crime Impact Statement are addressed.

Rights of Way – To compensate for the loss of the existing footpaths along Runger Lane footpaths would be provided along both sides of the realigned road. The subway under the M56 motorway would remain.

Aerodrome Safeguarding – No objections have been raised by the Aerodrome Safeguarding Officer.

Environmental Impact Assessment – The applicants submitted a detailed Environmental Impact Assessment with the proposal, the application has been advertised accordingly.

Town and Country Planning (Green Belt) Direction 2005 – As the application is not considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt there is no requirement to refer the development to the Secretary of State.

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 the 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 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:

WYTHENSHAW AREA COMMITTEE: Refuse due to the impact on the residential amenity of those residents living near to the scheme; the impact on the environment; and the economic benefits of the development had not been justified.

HEAD OF PLANNING: Approve on the basis that the proposal is in accordance with the City Council's Unitary Development Plan, in particular the following policies and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise:

Policy H2.2 states that the City Council will not normally allow development which will have an unacceptable impact on residential areas. It is not believed that the proposed development will have a detrimental impact in terms of noise, vibration, traffic generation, road safety and air pollution or through its scale and appearance.

Policy EW20 states that the future expansion of, and future development at, Manchester Airport will take place within the Airport Operational Area. The application site is located within the Airport Operational Area.

Policy EW21 states that a 'Major Developed Site' within the Green Belt has been identified at Manchester Airport and that infilling and re-development within the boundary of this site will be treated as appropriate development providing it meets the tests set out in Annex C of PPG2 and is in line with the developments and uses listed within the policy reason. The proposal meets the tests set out in PPG2 and is one of the uses listed within the policy reason.

Policy EW24 states that the City Council will seek to ensure that a high standard of landscaping is provided throughout the Airport Operational Area, it is believed that the proposed landscaping scheme will accord with this policy.

Policy EW25 states that in considering applications for development within the Airport Operational Area, the City Council will require a high standard of design which reflects the prestigious nature of an international gateway Airport and its location with and adjacent to the Greater Manchester Green Belt. It is believed that the proposal will accord with this policy.

Policy E2.1 states that within the Green Belt planning permission will not be granted, except in very special circumstances, it states further that the City 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. The proposal meets the tests set out in PPG2 and is sited within 'Major Developed Site' within the Green Belt, it is therefore considered to be appropriate development.

Policy E2.3 states that the City Council will protect important wildlife habitats, and where appropriate, will designate areas as local nature reserves. The proposed mitigation measures will protect the existing Great Crested Newts colony.

Policy T4 states that in dealing with all proposals connected with the Airport, the City Council will continue to pursue its present policy of seeking to promote its development in a way which is environmentally a sensitive. It is anticipated that the proposal will achieve a *very good* BREEAM rating.

Policy DC16 states that in considering development proposals for any site, the retention of existing trees and the planting of new trees within the public highway

and along the public frontages of the site will be encouraged by the City Council. The applicants are proposing extensive planting between the site and the realigned Runger lane and also along the eastern bank of the M56 motorway.

Policy DC19 states that in determining applications for development involving or having an impact on listed buildings, the City Council will have regard to the desirability of securing the retention, restoration, maintenance and continued use of such buildings and to protecting their general setting. Following amendments to the development the listed dwelling, Rose Cottage, is retained.

Conditions

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) 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: 15435/AO/020F, A1/021L, A1/022D, A1/023C, A1/026F, A1/027C, A1/028F, A1/210A

Reason -To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Pursuant to policy H2.2 and policies EW20, EW23, EW24, EW25, EW30 and E2.3 of the Manchester Unitary Development Plan.

3) No development that is hereby approved shall commence unless and until samples and specifications of all materials to be used on all external elevations of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as 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 EW25 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

4) No development shall commence until a hard and soft landscaping treatment scheme has been 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 the buildings are first occupied. 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 agree in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason -To ensure that a satisfactory landscaping scheme for the development is carried out that respects the character and visual amenities of the area, in accordance with policy EW24 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of

Manchester and pursuant to the guidance contained within Circular 1/2003 Safeguarding Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas: the Town and Country Planning (Safeguarded Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas) Direction 2002

5) Development shall not commence until a licence pursuant to the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994 authorising the disturbance of any great crested newts on or resorting to the site has been issued .

Reason -for the protection of great crested newts and so as to ensure compliance with directive 92/43/EEC (the Habitats Directive)

6) The car parking indicated on the approved plans shall be surfaced, demarcated and made available for use prior to the buildings hereby approved being occupied. The car park shall then be available at all times whilst the site is occupied.

Reason -To ensure that there is adequate parking for the development proposed when the buildings are occupied in order to comply with Policy T2.6 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

7) No development shall commence until details of the measures to be incorporated into the development (or phase thereof) to demonstrate how Secured by Design accreditation will be achieved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. 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 local planning authority has acknowledged in writing that it has received written confirmation of a Secured 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 "Delivering Sustainable Development".

8) The development hereby approved shall achieve a post-construction Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) rating of at least 'very good' or 'excellent' and at least three star sustainability rating under the code for sustainable homes for those elements of the development which are residential in nature. 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.

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, policies ER13 and DP3 of Regional Planning Guidance for the North West (RPG13) and the principles contained within The Guide to Development in Manchester 2 SPD and Planning Policy Statement 1.

9) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, detailed plans of the internal ancillary office accommodation shall be submitted to and be approved by the City Council as Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented in accordance with those approved details.

Reason -To ensure that the development is accessible for disabled employees and visitors, pursuant to Policy DC9 in the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

10) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision and implementation of a surface water regulation system has been approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason -To reduce the increased risk of flooding, pursuant to Planning Policy Statement 25, "Development and Flood Risk"

11) Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from the development shall be passed through an oil interceptor designed and constructed to have a capacity and details compatible with, the site being drained. Roof water shall not pass through the interceptor.

Reason -To prevent pollution of nearby watercourse, pursuant to Planning Policy Statement 25, "Development and Flood Risk"

12) It is anticipated that cranes may be used in the construction process. Cranes, whilst they are temporary, can be a hazard to air safety, due to their height. The developer or crane operator should notify Manchester Airport Airfield Operations at least 1 month in advance of requiring to erect or to use a crane or any other tall construction equipment. Provided there is no conflict with any aerodrome safeguarding criteria; a Manchester Airport Crane permit will be issued.

Reason -To ensure that Manchester Airport's obstacle limitation surfaces are protected and to ensure the safe operation of aircraft, pursuant to the guidance contained within Circular 1/2003 Safeguarding Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas: the Town and Country Planning (Safeguarded Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas) Direction 2002

13) The wheels of contractors vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned and the access roads leading to the site swept daily in accordance with a management scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority prior to any works commencing on site.

Reason -In the interest of pedestrian and highway safety, as specified in policy H2.2 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

14) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of the incorporation of the approved development into Manchester Airport's Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the City Council as Local Planning Authority. The amended Travel Plan shall then be implemented and maintained in accordance with those approved details within 2 months of occupation of the development hereby approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority.

Reason -To encourage the use of transport other than single occupancy of a car in accordance with the principles of sustainable transport, pursuant to the provisions contained within Planning Policy Guidance 13.

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: 086879/FO/2008/S2 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 held by the Planning Division.

The following residents, businesses and other third parties in the area were consulted/notified on the application:

English Heritage (NW Region)
Environment Agency
Twentieth Century Society
Ancient Monuments Society
Georgian Group
Victorian Society
Society For The Protection Of Ancient Buildings
Council For British Archaeology
North West Regional Assembly
GMPTE
Greater Manchester Police
Macclesfield Borough Council
Trafford MBC
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
Bollin Valley Project
Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit
Cheshire County Council
Manchester Airport Safeguarding Officer
The Highways Agency
Natural England
28-36 Burnside, Manchester, WA150SG
411-415, 476-482 Hale Road, Manchester, WA158XT
Rose Cottage, Hasty Lane, Altrincham, Manchester, WA15 8UT
Brookfield, Hasty Lane, Manchester, WA158UU
Garden House, Hasty Lane, Manchester, WA158UU
White Piers, Hasty Lane, Manchester, WA158UU
Fern Cottage, Hale Road, Manchester, WA158XN
Males Tractor Service, Hasty Lane, Manchester, WA158UR
Breeze Hill, Hasty Lane, Manchester, WA158UT
The Cottage, Hasty Lane, Manchester, WA158UT
Oak Croft, Hasty Lane, Manchester, WA158UU
Ring-a-roses, Hasty Lane, Manchester, WA158UT
Manchester Airport Marriott, Hale Road, Manchester, WA158XW

Representations were received from the following third parties:

Petition of 1026 signatures
Peter Johnson, Breeze Hill, Hasty Lane, Altrincham, Cheshire, WA15 8UT
Anthony Lowe, Rose Cottage, Hasty Lane, Altrincham, Manchester, WA15 8UT
Stop Expansion at Manchester Airport Coalition
Greater Manchester Archaeology Unit
Greater Manchester Police
Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
Natural England
North West Regional Assembly
English Heritage
Highways Agency
Environment Agency
Aerodrome Safeguarding Officer
The Ramblers Association

Relevant Contact Officer : David Lawless
Telephone number : 0161 234 4543
Email : d.lawless@manchester.gov.uk