

Question No 63 - Design Principles

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (8) In Part (3) No (0)

Yes (LP321-62, LP318-26, LP291-40, LP290-24, LP267-43, LP28-63, LP27-3, LP9-33)

In part (LP315-24, LP272-19, LP2-1)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	Policy supported.	Support noted.	LP28-63, LP27-3, LP318-26, LP291-40
2	General support. Specific comment around delivery of the policy and the need to involve local people in decision making.	Support noted. No change proposed to the plan.	LP267-43
3	General support. Suggest the inclusion of a reference to Sport England's Active Design guidance.	Support noted. No change proposed to the plan.	LP9-33
4	General support. Highlight developments adjacent to SRN routes should consider visual/acoustic impacts, with boundary treatments/landscape buffers complementing SRN safety and operational standards.	Support noted. No change proposed to the plan.	LP321-62
5	General support. Encourage the Local Plan to adopt car-free development where suitable	Support noted. No change proposed to the plan.	LP290-24
6	General support. Suggest the policy could be amended to give sufficient flexibility whilst	Support noted. No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole and flexibility is applied at appropriate points (e.g. Policy DC1).	LP272-19

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	maintaining a high-quality design approach as follows “Encourage innovative design solutions that contribute positively to the urban fabric and enhance the evolving character of regeneration areas, whilst ensuring deliverability.”		
7	General support. Suggest streets for all design guidance should be incorporated into the Local Plan.	Support noted. No change proposed to the plan. . The Local Plan should be read alongside Places for Everyone Joint Local Plan that contains policies that covered aspects raised by streets for all.	LP2-1
8	General support. Suggest addition of how design principles need to account of developments adjacent to canals as a specific point ion the policy.	Support noted. No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole, and sufficient policy content covers canals (e.g. Policy EN2).	LP315-24
9	Additional policy clause suggested to cover sustainable drainage.	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole. Sustainable drainage is already covered in thematic policies EN1, EN2 and EN6.	LP386-28
10	Suggest standards specifically account for people who are neurodivergent, with accessibility and safety standards for disabled people and sufficient private amenity space in the most appropriate locations. This is especially important for tall buildings and heritage buildings and sites.	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole. Policies DM1, DM3 and DC1 include specific clauses setting out the need to account for accessibility within buildings and neighbourhoods.	LP385-52
11	Requirement for investment in the Castlefield area at an early stage of the Local Plan delivery.	No change proposed to the plan. This is a matter for delivery of the plan post adoption.	LP360-5
13	Concerns about a number of issues including the overdevelopment of the city; visual disamenity caused by modern buildings being erected which are not in keeping with existing heritage assets; impact from street furniture clutter; taller front doors;	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole. The issues raised are covered across various policies (e.g. Policies DP1 and DM1)	LP344-1

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	greater spacing between new properties; green belt should be preserved, but new housing on brownfield sites needs to have adequate space; reuse of existing buildings should be prioritised over new builds. Building materials should be recycled where possible.		
14	Request flexibility to space standards to account for alternative residential living proposals.	No change proposed to the plan. The diminution of space standards will not feature in the Local Plan.	LP314-4
15	Suggested changes including cost mitigation whereby grants or incentives are provided for affordable housing providers to meet design standards; the need for flexible design guidance, for example alternative solutions for high-density sites such as shared amenity spaces. Social Value Integration: Include metrics for community cohesion and well-being alongside design quality. Maintenance Support: Encourage partnerships for long-term upkeep of design features.	No change proposed to the plan. The points raised are appropriate for future implementation and monitoring of the plan.	LP278-26
16	Add an additional bullet point to ensure residential development is designed in accordance with the principles of Active Design.	The supporting text highlights the intention to update the Residential Design Quality guidance as part of the implementation of the Local Plan and the consideration of Active Design will feature within that guidance.	LP277-11
17	Policy supported but highlight there is unnecessary duplication in policies Policy DM1: Development	No change proposed to the plan. The level of detail within the policies identified is considered	LP264-7

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	Management; Policy DM2: Residential Extensions; Policy DM3: Flat Conversions; and Policy DM4: Housing on Backland Sites, particularly as it is noted that Policy D1 states that further guidance will be set out in the supporting document to the Local Plan - Residential Quality Guidance.	necessary justifying a degree of cross over between the policies.	

Question No 64 - Character Areas

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (3) In Part (3) No (1)

Yes (LP385-53, LP291-41, LP28-64)

In part (LP321-63, LP315-25, LP266-9)

No (LP267-44)

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	Agree with the policy, no further comments.	Support noted.	LP291-41
2	Agree with the policy in part, with further comments.	Support noted.	LP321-63, LP315-25, LP266-9
3	Do not agree, with further comments	Objection noted.	LP267-44
	Roads and Access		
4	Development along arterial routes should be assessed for visual impact, accessibility, and integration with the strategic road network (SRN).	Specific points will be covered in planning applications.	LP321-63
5	Large buildings near the strategic road network (SRN) should have transport assessments covering traffic flow, safety and wayfinding.	Transport Assessments are covered in Policy JP C7 of Places for Everyone.	LP321-63
6	Support modal shift.	Comment noted.	LP321-63

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
7	Opportunities to link character area improvements with active travel and green corridors should be explored.	Comment noted.	LP321-63
	District Centres		
8	Wilmslow Road in Withington is an inappropriate location for tall buildings, and an increase in scale and massing, due to its distinctive heritage character.	The character areas provide a starting point for different parts of the city, and the policy will need to be read alongside other policies in the plan that will guide design and location specific matters.	LP297-20
9	Fallowfield district centre should be excluded from further tall buildings, which would be harmful to the local character of Victorian streets and cohesive architecture.	The character areas provide a starting point for different parts of the city, and the policy will need to be read alongside other policies in the plan that will guide design and location specific matters.	LP293-3
10	District centres in Manchester will not normally be appropriate places for increases in scale and massing because of the prevailing built forms. The proposal to increase scale and massing in district centres should be removed.	The character areas provide a starting point for different parts of the city, and the policy will need to be read alongside other policies in the plan that will guide design and location specific matters.	LP267-44
	Heritage		
11	The policy should be amended to cover all designated heritage assets, not just listed buildings and conservation areas. Suggested amendment to	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as whole and Policies D4 and D5 provide	LP318-27

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	paragraph 15.9: <i>“Any development brought forward must also take into account site specific issues and, where appropriate, the need to conserve or enhance heritage assets such as listed buildings and conservation areas. ...”</i>	sufficient detail with respect to designated heritage assets.	
12	The policy should cover other relevant education facilities in a historic context, such as Xaverian College. It is unclear if this is included in the Higher Education Precinct.	The character areas provide a starting point for different parts of the city, and the policy will need to be read alongside other policies in the plan that will guide design and location specific matters.	LP310-6
	Design		
13	Context-sensitive design encourages developments to respect local character, heritage, and landscape features. Fostering integrated communities, reducing stigma and promoting social cohesion.	The character areas provide a starting point for different parts of the city, and the policy will need to be read alongside other policies in the plan that will guide design and location specific matters.	LP278-27
14	High design expectations (e.g., “innovative contemporary buildings” and “high-quality public realm”) may increase costs, making affordable housing delivery less viable without subsidies.	The Viability Assessment has taken account of the impact of policies in the Local Plan.	LP278-27
15	Provide Design Guidance for Affordable Housing: Ensure cost-effective ways to meet character requirements without compromising affordability.	The character areas provide a starting point for different parts of the city, and the policy will need to be read alongside other policies in the plan that will guide design and location specific matters.	LP278-27
	Place-making		

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
16	Emphasis on public realm, including focus on improving streetscapes, connectivity, and green infrastructure, benefits all residents, including those in affordable housing, by enhancing walkability and access to amenities.	The character areas provide a starting point for different parts of the city, and the policy will need to be read alongside other policies including those in the Environment and Transport sections.	LP278-28
17	Opportunities for regeneration, like the Eastern Area and Central Arc for transformation, could provide sites for new affordable housing in locations with regeneration potential.	Comment noted. The plan should be read as a whole and policies within the plan cover housing including affordable housing that will be considered alongside character areas.	LP278-27
18	Policy promotes respecting existing built form, which may conflict with the need for higher-density affordable housing to meet demand, especially in suburban areas.	The Viability Assessment has taken account of the impact of policies in the Local Plan. The plan should be read as a whole and policies within the plan cover housing including affordable housing that will be considered alongside character areas.	LP278-27
19	Enhanced public realm and landscaping require ongoing upkeep. Social landlords may struggle to fund maintenance, risking deterioration and inequality in quality.	Comment noted. The challenge of maintenance is recognised and will feature within the consideration of planning proposals where appropriate.	LP278-27
20	Funding Support for Public Realm: Offer grants or partnerships to maintain high-quality shared spaces in affordable housing schemes.	Comment noted. The points raised are appropriate for future implementation of the plan.	LP278-27

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	Other		
21	Distinctive authentically-preserved buildings in character areas should be replicated.	Comment noted.	LP345-3
22	Industry should be retained at industrial sites, with modern industrial uses being introduced alongside older types of industry.	Comment noted.	LP345-3
23	Suggest splitting canals and river valleys into two distinct character areas as they have very different characters and typology.	No change proposed to the plan. It is considered the policy works alongside Policy EN2 that covers rivers and waterways including canals.	LP315-25
24	Policy D2 should be accompanied by a plan to identify the character areas.	No change proposed to the plan. The Character Areas do not have specific defined boundaries which could be represented on a plan.	LP310-6
25	Reference to tall buildings in second bullet point should be removed.	No change proposed to the plan. The inclusion of tall buildings is appropriate in the locations described in the plan and further detail is provided on Policy D3 with reference to tall buildings across the city.	LP297-20
26	Mandate Affordable Housing in Growth Areas: Especially in City Centre, Central Arc, and Eastern Area.	No change proposed to the plan. This is a matter for the housing policies and is specifically dealt with in Policy H2.	LP278-27
27	The MIX Manchester site near the airport should be excluded from the wider Wythenshawe character area, as it is not part of the garden city typology.	The character areas provide a starting point for different parts of the city, and the policy will need to be read alongside other policies in the plan that will	LP266-9

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
		guide design and location specific matters including a specific policy on Mix Manchester.	
28	Introduce Social Value Metrics: Assess how developments contribute to inclusivity and community well-being.	No change proposed to the plan. This is a matter for the Policy SI3 which covers social value.	LP278-27

Question No 65 - Tall Buildings

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (2) In Part (8) No (0)

Yes (LP321-64, LP318-28)

In part (LP315-26, LP305-27, LP299-21, LP292-27, 290-25, LP267-45, LP28-65, LP3-1)

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	Agree with the policy, with further comments.	Support noted, further responses below.	LP321-64 LP318-28 LP285-11 LP284-30
2	Agree in part, with further comments.	Partial support noted, further responses below.	LP292-27, LP261-37 LP315-26 LP305-27 LP299-21 LP290-25 LP278-28 LP267-45 LP28-65 LP3-1
	Do not agree with the policy.	Objection noted.	LP309-57
	Environment		
3	It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to build tall buildings that contribute positively to sustainability, due to the increasing carbon impact as height increases.	Comment noted. The plan should be read as a whole, and carbon impacts are specifically dealt with in the zero-carbon section of the plan.	LP292-27, LP261-37 LP267-45
4	Proposals for very tall buildings should be subject to robust climate scenario modelling; extreme weather could include high winds, extreme heat, rain, and cold.	These matters are dealt with in detail at the planning application stage and the Local Plan sets out the expectations for such considerations across a range of policies.	LP292-27, LP261-37

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
5	Danger of bird strikes needs proper consideration. Manchester should have a specific policy to ensure all new high rises are bird safe. Practical suggestions made on how to reduce the problem.	No change proposed to the plan. Policies SP2 and DM1 provide sufficient policy detail covering the effects on natural resources and biodiversity.	LP404-25 LP299-21
6	The reference to sustainable development (prudent use of land) should be expanded to consider other elements of sustainability.	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole and in particular policies SP2 and DM1 which apply to all developments and included matters pertaining to sustainable development.	LP290-25
7	'Wind Microclimate Guidelines' should be produced to assess the impact on the local wind microclimate.	These matters are dealt with in detail at the planning application stage and off the shelf guidance is available and cited by developers.	LP3-1
8	Serious consideration needs to possible effects on local air turbulence.	These matters are dealt with in detail at the planning application stage and off the shelf guidance is available and cited by developers.	LP28-65
9	Serious consideration needs to be given of the impact on tall buildings of future climate changes.	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole and in particular policies SP2 and DM1 which apply to all developments and included matters pertaining to sustainable development.	LP28-65
10	Suggested additional text re canals and rivers: "Tall buildings adjacent to waterways must/ should demonstrate how they mitigate microclimate impacts and enhance the canal-side environment."	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole and in particular policy EN2 that covers rivers and waterways including canals.	LP315-26
	Placemaking		

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
11	Manchester already has too many tall buildings.	Comment noted.	LP292-27, LP261-37 LP344-2
12	The restriction of tall buildings outside the city centre is welcomed.	Comment noted.	LP292-27, LP261-37 LP378-1
13	The policy is too vague on the location of tall buildings.	The policy does not set out specific locational aspects as this is not appropriate for Manchester.	LP393-6 LP383-7
14	The policy is too vague on acceptable heights.	The policy is not prescriptive on heights as design solutions will be judged on individual proposals and the relative impact to the existing cityscape.	LP393-6 LP383-7
15	More green space needed around tall buildings.	The plan should be read as a whole and in particular the policies in the Environment section that set out the approach to delivering green space within the city.	LP388-11 LP308-38
16	Tall buildings have resulted in an intimidating streetscape.	Comment noted. No change proposed to the plan.	LP388-11 LP308-38
17	Manchester should restrict high rise apartments to very limited areas, such as has happened in Liverpool and elsewhere.	The policy does not set out specific locational aspects as this is not appropriate for Manchester.	LP388-11 LP308-38
18	Policy gives no protection for human-scale skyline.	The policy is not prescriptive on heights as design solutions will be judged on individual proposals and the relative impact to the existing cityscape.	LP374-19 LP360-12
19	Policy gives no protection for view corridors.	The policy does not set out specific locational aspects as this is not appropriate for Manchester.	LP374-19 LP360-12

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
20	Retain things which make Manchester such a distinctive place whilst also delivering development to meet the needs of its communities. This is a huge challenge, particularly if the densities and heights of developments continue to increase.	The policy is not prescriptive on heights as design solutions will be judged on individual proposals and the relative impact to the existing cityscape.	LP318-28
21	Impact on the character of the surrounding area is important.	The policy is not prescriptive on heights as design solutions will be judged on individual proposals and the relative impact to the existing cityscape.	LP318-28
22	Oppose a presumption in favour of tall buildings in district centres.	Comme noted. The policy is considered to be positively worded already.	LP267-45
	Specific Locations		
23	Certain locations are not appropriate locations for high density / high rise development. These include: • Moss Side (particularly the area where Moss Side meets the proposed Core Growth Area on Moss Lane East). LP393-6 • Aquarius estate (Hulme). LP393-6 • Victoria station. LP344-2 • Miles Platting LP296-20 • Castlefield (particularly regarding encroachment from St John's and Great Jackson Street areas) LP374-19 LP360-12 Castlefield: LP374-19 LP360-12 • Castlefield basin and viaduct areas should have specific height transition policy	The policy does not set out specific locational aspects as this is not appropriate for Manchester.	

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	- Views from Castlefield basin and viaduct areas should be protected. - Suggest context-sensitive design code referencing the existing Castlefield Forum Design Guidelines or request the Council commission one.		
24	Piccadilly station and concourse 'has been ruined'.	Comment noted.	LP344-2
	People		
25	The cladding crisis has trapped many households in unsaleable flats, which have evolved into households with children living in inappropriate homes.	Comment noted. Other legislative mechanisms are in place to deal with cladding issues.	LP388-11 LP308-38
26	Towers do not meet the most acute housing need e.g. low-income families, people waiting for social housing, or the homeless.	The supporting text for Policy H1 in the plan sets out guidance on housing mix for differing parts of the city.	LP388-11 LP308-38
27	The impact on and practicalities for disabled people should be carefully considered.	Comment noted. The plan should be read as a whole with inclusive aspects and accessibility issues picked up particularly in Policies SP2 and DM1 that apply to all developments.	LP385-54
28	Tall building policy for scale, amenity and character should be strengthened to address pressures from purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA) on infrastructure and neighbourhood sustainability.	Policy H7 specifically deals with PBSA and the plan should be read as a whole with considerations in Policy D3 to be read alongside Policy H7.	LP293-6

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
29	Cumulative impacts of PBSA and tall buildings on local services and long-term community sustainability should be assessed.	Policy H7 specifically deals with PBSA and the plan should be read as a whole with considerations in Policy D3 to be read alongside Policy H7.	LP293-6
30	Require a percentage of units in tall buildings to be social or affordable housing.	The supporting text for Policy H1 in the plan sets out guidance on housing mix for differing parts of the city. The plan is not prescriptive in terms of specific regulation in terms of tall buildings or other forms of development.	LP278-28
31	Encourage mixed-tenure models to prevent social segregation.	The supporting text for Policy H1 in the plan sets out guidance on housing mix for differing parts of the city. The plan is not prescriptive in terms of specific approaches to tenure within developments.	LP278-28
	Heritage & Design		
32	Some modern buildings are not in-keeping with heritage assets.	Comment noted.	LP344-2
33	Design Standards for Affordable Housing: Include guidance on communal spaces, play areas, and family-sized units within tall buildings.	Policy D1 provides key principles for design, and the supporting text highlights the intention to update the Residential Design Quality guidance as part of the implementation of the Local Plan.	LP278-28
	Other		
34	The definition of tall buildings is too vague.	The policy does not set out specific definitions for tall buildings as this would be too prescriptive to include.	LP292-27, LP261-37 LP267-45
35	Where tall buildings are close by to the strategic road network (SRN), skyline changes should not	Comment noted.	LP321-64

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	interfere with driver sight lines or create visual distractions.		
36	Suggested additional text re aviation safety, along with details of specific requirements: All proposals for tall buildings must clearly demonstrate how they would not adversely impact aviation safety."	The plan should be read as a whole and in particular Policy DM9 that deals with development and aerodrome safeguarding.	LP305-27
37	The requirement to justify the deliverability of such proposals is particularly important given the effects that unimplemented permissions can have on sterilising sites.	The viability assessment has considered tall buildings within the typology of proposals covered by the study.	LP284-30
38	Long-Term Management Plans: Ensure robust maintenance strategies to avoid issues seen in past high-rise affordable housing.	No change proposed to the plan. This is outside the remit of the Local Plan.	LP278-28

Question No 66 - Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (5) In Part (2) No (0)

Yes (LP385-55, LP309-58, LP297-21, LP267-46, LP28-66)

In part (LP321-65, LP315-27)

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	Agree, with further comments.	Support noted.	LP404-26 LP309-58 LP291-42 LP267-46
2	Agree, no further comments.	Support noted.	LP385-55 LP297-21 LP28-66
3	Agree in part, with further comments.	Support noted	LP321-65 LP315-27
	Conservation Areas		
4	Paved front gardens are harming conservation areas.	Comment noted	LP404-26
5	Suggest adding wording after "expect high quality design"; "suitable building materials to match the historic context need to be used in conservation areas i.e. timber windows. Stained glass windows should be retained in refurbishments."	No proposed change to the plan. The policy wording provides sufficient flexibility that takes account of the issue/objection raised.	LP404-26

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
6	Conservation areas should consider biodiversity e.g. include bat bricks, bat tiles and swift bricks.	No change proposed to the plan. A conservation area designation would not exclude the consideration of biodiversity, for example, bat bricks, bat tiles and swift bricks.	LP404-26
7	New conservation areas should be established.	No change proposed to the plan. A conservation review is underway and is being progressed through the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and not as part of the Local Plan.	LP345-4
8	The policy should recognise that there are opportunities for new development within conservation areas.	No change proposed to the plan. The policy acknowledges that there will be new development within conservation areas as it started "New development will ...". The policy wording provides sufficient flexibility that takes account of the issue/objection raised.	LP310-7
	Enforcement		
9	Policy is not working properly at present	No change proposed to the plan. Comments noted. The policy is in line with National Policy.	LP404-26
10	Enforcement of existing rules is inadequate	No change proposed to the plan. Enforcement is a matter for implementation of the plan.	LP404-26
11	MCC should be more proactive in this policy area.	No change proposed to the plan. Comments noted.	LP360-21 LP374-20

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
12	Aim to undo bad refurbishments using cheap upvc windows and take opportunities to restore original features.	No change proposed to the plan. Within domestic properties, alterations to windows are permitted development within conservation areas.	LP404-26
	Green spaces		
13	Policy should include small-scale community gardens.	No change proposed to the plan. The policy provides sufficient guidance to consider issues on a case-by-case basis in any development proposals.	LP267-46
14	Ryebank fields should become a registered park.	No change proposed to the plan. Historic England designates registered parks and gardens.	LP267-46
	Other		
15	Fascia changes in surviving historic built environment should be addressed.	No change proposed to the plan. The policy plus National Policy and the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 section 72 provide adequate flexibility to consider this issue on a case-by-case basis and taking account of the setting and other considerations.	LP345-4
16	Amend the policy to allow for alterations to heritage assets for safety reasons.	No change proposed to the plan. The wording in the policy plus National Policy and the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 section 72 provide adequate guidance to consider issue on a case-by-case basis.	LP315-27
17	Historic England state "Whilst we support the intention of Policy D4, we would welcome the opportunity to work with the Council to redraft this	Change agreed. Policy amended following collaborative working with Historic England.	LP318-29

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	policy as there are a number of issues with the terminology used and its content."		

Question No 67 – Heritage

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (8) In Part (3) No (0)

Yes (LP404-27, LP395-25, LP385-56, LP309-59, LP292-28, LP267-47, LP28-67, LP20-4)

In part (LP321-66, LP315-28, LP272-20)

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	Agree, with further comments	Support Noted.	LP404-27 LP385-56 LP28-67 LP267-47 LP309-59 LP20-4
2	Agree in part, with further comments.	Support Noted.	LP321-66 LP272-20 LP318-30 LP315-28, LP261-38
	Green & Blue Infrastructure		
3	Gardens and trees around heritage assets should be preserved	No change proposed to the plan. The Heritage policy refers to settings, and this is referred to in paragraph 15.20, includes landscapes. Also, this is dealt with in other policies in the plan see Policy EN3.	LP404-27
4	The policy should protect natural heritage including ancient woodlands, veteran and ancient trees, historic field boundaries, and long-established landscapes as these hold cultural, ecological, and historical significance equal to that of the built environment.	No change proposed to the plan. The Heritage policy refers to settings, and this is referred to in paragraph 15.20, includes landscapes. Policy EN3 deals with the removal of a tree within a Conservation Area or subject to a Tree Preservation Order. Landscapes are covered in EN3 and D1, D2, D4 and DM1. Where other policies in the Local Plan	LP312-9

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
		deal with these matters they are not repeated as the plan should be read as a whole.	
	Climate		
5	Buildings should be retained to help tackle the climate crisis (embedded carbon)	No proposed change to the policy. Policy ZC1 seeks to where possible reuse or refurbish existing buildings within a site. It sets out standards for energy efficiency for conversions or refurbishment. The completion of a Sustainability Statement/Assessment could provide the justification as to why the standards in these policies couldn't be met and historic interest could be a reason for this. See further amendments to ZC1.	LP345-2
6	A balance should be struck between preserving historic buildings and addressing climate change; it is not always viable to make changes to buildings to meet energy efficiency standards. Suggest policy amendment: " <i>Secure the continued beneficial use of heritage assets while allowing them to meet changing needs and adapt to climate change.</i> "	No proposed change to the policy. Policy ZC1 seeks to where possible reuse or refurbish existing buildings within a site. It sets out standards for energy efficiency for conversions or refurbishment. The completion of a Sustainability Statement/Assessment could provide the justification as to why the standards in these policies couldn't be met and historic interest could be a reason for this. See further amendments to ZC1.	LP20-4
7	Welcome the criteria " <i>secure the continued beneficial use of heritage asset while allowing them</i>	No proposed change to the policy. Policy ZC1 seeks to where possible reuse or refurbish existing buildings within a site. It sets out standards for	LP315-28

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	<i>to meet changing needs and adapt to climate change".</i>	energy efficiency for conversions or refurbishment. The completion of a Sustainability Statement/Assessment could provide the justification as to why the standards in these policies couldn't be met and historic interest could be a reason for this. See further amendments to ZC1.	
	City Centre		
8	Heritage assets in Castlefield have been subject to damage from invasive plant ingress	Comments noted. This is not within the remit of the Local Plan.	LP374-21 LP360-8
9	Heritage assets in Castlefield are a target for graffiti vandals	Comments noted. This is not within the remit of the Local Plan.	LP374-21 LP360-8
10	A responsible plan for City Centre heritage must make protection, preservation policies, and funding central, especially for existing owners of degrading and vandalised structures.	Comments noted. This is not within the remit of the Local Plan.	LP374-21 LP360-8
11	University development should not harm the heritage of the city.	Comments noted. All development is subject to the due process with consideration of all matters relating to a proposal including heritage. Where heritage is a considered, this reflects national and local policy.	LP344-3
	Non-Designated Heritage		

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
12	Policy doesn't cover cultural identity, storytelling or intangible heritage	No change proposed to the plan. Further text is to be added to the reasoned justification to the Heritage policy providing further narrative around the City's heritage. Also see Chapter 5 Spatial Portrait for more information on the heritage of the City.	LP374-21 LP360-8
13	Non-designated Heritage Assets should be given increased protection through the creation of a local list or similar.	No change proposed to the plan. Non-designated heritage assets are adequately dealt with in the Heritage policy. The consideration of non-designated heritage assets is dealt with on a case-by-case basis as part of the development management process.	LP345-2
14	Local community should be involved in identifying NDHAs.	No change proposed to the plan. Non-designated heritage assets are adequately dealt with in the Heritage policy.	LP28-67 LP267-47 LP261-38
	New Developments		
15	Developments near heritage assets adjacent to SRN corridors should be assessed for visual, environmental and access impacts.	No proposed change to the plan. Consideration of impact on heritage assets is dealt with on a case-by-case basis as part of the development management process.	LP321-66
16	Liaison with National Highways should be prioritised where transport-related developments may affect visibility, access or environmental conditions of heritage assets.	No proposed change to the plan. Comments noted.	LP321-66

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
17	Clarify within the supporting text for Policy D 5 that the level of detail required for heritage impact assessments should be proportionate to the significance of the asset and the scale of the proposed development.	No proposed change to the plan. Information on Heritage Impact Assessments is found within NPPF and planning guidance, plus Historic England Guidance.	LP272-20
	Archaeology		
18	The Local Plan needs to set out the considerations which would need to be taken into account when considering archaeology of less than national importance.	Change agreed. Amend plan to include reference to archaeology.	LP318-30
19	Local Plans should specify requirements for the assessment, evaluation, recording, preservation, monitoring and/or management of archaeological remains. Currently the plan is lacking in this regard. Policy and/or justification text needs to include a preference for archaeology to be preserved in situ, for development to avoid or minimise harm and, where necessary, arrangements for the excavation and recording of features. Reference should also be made to the Historic Environment Record (HER).	Change agreed. Amend plan to include reference to archaeology.	LP318-30
20	Suggested Change: Include appropriate policy coverage in the Plan on how the local planning	Change agreed. Amend plan to include reference to archaeology.	LP318-30

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	authority intends to approach development proposals affecting designated and non-designated archaeology. This could be achieved through the introduction of a separate policy on archaeology or through amendments to draft Policy D5.		
21	Paragraph 15.20 should be amended to acknowledge that non-designated heritage assets can include non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest which are demonstrably of equivalent significance as scheduled monuments (in line with NPPF footnote 75).	Change agreed. Amend plan to include reference to archaeology.	LP318-30
	Policy amendments		
22	A minor amendment is needed to the final bullet point of D5 Heritage in order to bring it more in line with the provisions of the NPPF paragraph 203: a. Amend the final bullet point to Policy D5 as follows: <i>‘Avoid harm to the significance of heritage assets, but where unavoidable clearly demonstrate the public benefit of the proposals and seek to mitigate the harm in all cases.’</i> b. Set out, either as part of the policy or its supporting a list of those elements of Manchester’s	Change agreed. Add further information on the elements of Manchester’s historic environment that are especially important to its character in the reasoned justification.	LP318-30

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	historic environment that are of especial importance to its character. c. Switch the order in which Policies D4 and Policy D5 appear in the Plan.		
23	Policy D5 -Heritage - seems to continue on policy D4 and seems to repeat some parts.	No change proposed to the plan. Comments noted.	LP315-28
24	We assume that inclusion of this in policy D5 means this statement also applies to listed buildings? If it does not then there should be similar wording to this included in policy D4 as well (ie to allow heritage asset to be able to be adapted to beneficial use, changing needs, climate change).	No proposed change to the plan. Policy ZC1 seeks to where possible reuse or refurbish existing buildings within a site. See further amendments to ZC1.	LP315-28
25	The first line of this policy should be softened by the inclusion of a "where feasible". While there should always be a presumption in favour of retention there may be examples where this is not feasible.	No proposed change to the plan. During the development management process due consideration will be given to all matters affecting a proposal and planning balance applied. The Local Plan should be read as a whole and other policies will also have a bearing on a proposal allowing a case-by-case approach.	LP284-31
26	Suggest amendment of the policy: <i>"Support creative solutions for the re-use and sensitive integration of heritage assets within new development, recognising that appropriate change can be the best form of preservation and that the character of</i>	No proposed change to the plan. During the development management process due consideration will be given to all matters affecting a proposal and planning balance applied. The Local Plan should be read as a whole and other policies	LP272-20

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	<i>regeneration areas can evolve to create a positive new character whilst respecting historic elements."</i>	will also have a bearing on a proposal allowing a case-by-case approach.	
	Other		
27	Policy needs strong enforcement	No proposed change to the plan. Enforcement is a matter for implementation of the plan.	LP404-27
28	Proposed policy lacks recognition that our heritage assets are being degraded.	No proposed change to the plan. Comments noted.	LP374-21 LP360-8
29	Redevelopment should be in the style of surrounding historic buildings	No proposed change to the plan. Comments noted.	LP345-2 LP344-3
30	There is historically important art on Eastford Square ("In The Machine" by William George Mitchell [1925-2000]). This should have information boards and careful maintenance of the surrounding area.	No proposed change to the policy. This is not within the remit of the Local Plan.	LP309-59
31	It is essential that the Plan sets out a robust policy framework for how Manchester's historic buildings, areas, and archaeology will be managed, how threats to heritage assets are addressed, and how historic buildings and areas are used to deliver the objectives for the plan area and secure their long-term future.	No proposed change to the plan. See further changes to the policy.	LP318-30

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
32	Policy does not explicitly ensure that heritage-led regeneration benefits low-income communities or prevents gentrification, which can displace vulnerable residents.	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole and specific policies including Policies SP2 and DM1 provide key principles and matters to consider for all development proposed, taking account of the relationship between new and existing development. PfE policy PolicyJP-P1 addresses socially inclusive development. Local Plan SP2 provides an overarching policy to ensure development in all parts of the City makes a positive contribution to neighbourhoods of choice. Monitoring of displacement is outside the scope of the plan.	LP278-29
33	Introduce Funding Mechanisms: Grants or tax incentives for heritage-sensitive affordable housing projects.	No change proposed to the plan. This is outside the remit of the Local Plan.	LP278-29
34	Provide Design Guidance: Offer clear standards for balancing heritage conservation with modern housing needs.	No proposed change to the plan. During the development management process due consideration will be given to all matters affecting a proposal and planning balance applied. The Local Plan should be read as a whole and other policies will also have a bearing on a proposal allowing a case-by-case approach.	LP278-29
35	Encourage Mixed-Use Models: Combine heritage preservation with affordable housing and community facilities to maximise public benefit.	No proposed change to the plan. During the development management process due consideration will be given to all matters affecting a proposal and planning balance applied. The Local Plan should be read as a whole and other policies	LP278-29

	Respondents' comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
		will also have a bearing on a proposal allowing a case-by-case approach.	
36	Policy D5 provides helpful high-level policy for conservation and enhancement of heritage assets.	No proposed change to the plan. Comments noted.	LP318-30
37	Promote Inclusive Heritage Regeneration: Require community engagement and ensure affordable housing is integrated into heritage-led schemes.	No proposed change to the plan. During the development management process due consideration will be given to all matters affecting a proposal and planning balance applied. The Local Plan should be read as a whole and other policies will also have a bearing on a proposal allowing a case-by-case approach.	LP278-29