

Manchester Local Plan Review Consultation Statement

September 2025

1. Introduction

1.1 This report includes a summary of the process and results of the Manchester Local Plan (Issues and Options Stage) Consultation, which ran for twelve weeks from Friday 7th February to Friday 1st May 2020. This followed approval of the plans by Manchester City Council (MCC)'s Executive committee on Wednesday 15th January 2020.

1.2 The results have helped inform the draft Local Plan which is currently being published for another consultation.

2. Issues and Options Stage Consultation process (2020)

1.1 There were three main ways for people/organisations to submit their views:

- the online consultation website at <https://manchester-consult.objective.co.uk/portal>
- by email to planningstrategy@manchester.gov.uk
- by post, to the Planning Strategy team at Manchester Town Hall

2.1 Notification

2.1.1 All people and organisations that were on the Council's planning policy database were contacted by email or by post to inform them of the consultation. This database is made up of people and organisations who have asked to be kept informed of the Council's planning policy changes.

2.1.2 In total, 624 contacts were informed, comprising individuals or organisations. Of these, a small number (seven) were contacted by post, and the great majority (617) by email.

2.1.3 The consultees include individual members of the public, local groups such as tenants and residents associations, 'friends of' groups, various campaigning groups, voluntary groups etc, national organisations, 'specific consultees' as required by statute, equalities groups, business representatives (landowners, etc.) as well as planning consultants and developers.

2.1.4 The law setting out who should be consulted (as a minimum) is set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012. The consultees include equalities groups representing

the characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010. A list of equalities groups that we notified about the Local Plan Issues and Options consultation is at Appendix 2.

2.1.5 In addition, the consultation information was provided to MCC's neighbourhood teams for them to share with their networks, and details were provided to MACC (Manchester's voluntary and community sector support organisation) so they could inform their members.

2.2 Website and Social Media

2.2.1 The consultation was featured on the Council's website from Friday 7th February 2020, at the following address:

https://secure.manchester.gov.uk/news/article/8337/manchester_s_major_review_of_its_local_plan_begins

2.2.2 This includes a link to the 'consultation portal', here: <https://manchester-consult.objective.co.uk/portal>

2.2.3 The content was similar to that included at Appendix 1.

2.2.4 There were 139.9k Impressions and 654 Link Clicks. The paid Facebook advert resulted in 181 clicks and 'reach' of 32,616. There were 1613 web page views.

2.2.5 The consultation was also featured in the Council's social media channels. This generated 27 social media posts, 240 Retweets/Likes on Twitter, and 914 'Likes' on Facebook.

2.3 Local and Specialist Media

2.3.1 A statement was provided to local and specialist media by the MCC News and Media Team on Monday 10th February 2020. This is included at Appendix 1.

2.4 Events

2.4.1 A number of drop-in consultation events were held across the city:

- Central library, 2nd March 2020, 28 people engaged (as measured by questionnaires collected)
- Inspire, Levenshulme, 27th February, 15 people engaged
- Wythenshawe Forum, 26th February, 11 people engaged
- Harpurhey Library, 24th February, 7 people engaged
- Abraham Moss Centre, 19th February, 5 people engaged
- Withington Baths, 17th February, 9 people engaged
- Total people engaged = 75.

2.4.2 Materials available at the events and elsewhere consisted of two key elements:

- the full Issues Consultation document; and
- a summary leaflet incorporating key questions about the issues consultation and signposting to the longer document and Council website for more details.

2.4.3 In addition, several information boards were produced. These covered various elements of the proposals and process and were displayed on easels at the events. The same information boards were displayed at each event. These are shown at Appendix 3.

2.4.4 Staff from MCC Planning Strategy attended the events and discussed the proposals with people there. These included members of the public who had attended specifically for the Local Plan events, and also people who were in the venue at the same time by chance. Some of the meetings were also attended by Planning students from the University of Manchester.

2.5 Meetings Attended

2.5.1 In addition to the drop-in events listed above, several other meetings were held with particular groups. These included:

- Cycle and Walking Forum; a presentation was given on 14th January 2020 covering the Local Plan Issues Consultation. A further full consultation session planned for 17th March was cancelled due to the Covid pandemic; instead, information was sent out electronically to Forum members for comment.
- Our Manchester Disabled Plan group (OMDP); a presentation was given to this group's Built Environment Workstream on 10th February.
- Our Manchester Forum: a presentation was given on 5th March.
- City Centre Residents' Forum (Climate Change); a workshop was held on 10th March and one group focussed on the role of the Local Plan with respect to climate change.
- CityCo (Manchester city centre management company); a presentation was given to their meeting on 11th March.

2.6 Responses received

2.6.1 The consultation response comprised 498 responses by email, along with online comments submitted via the Objective consultation website from 64 people/organisations who made 337 individual comments. The submissions fall broadly into those from individuals, from landowners and developers, from campaigning organisations, from statutory consultees, and from MCC partner organisations.

3. Consultation Results

3.1 Comments from Individuals

3.1.1 The comments from individuals (mostly local residents) cover a wide range of topics. Many people have commented on just one topic while others have commented on a whole range of subjects. Some of the submissions are very short while others have submitted lengthy documents.

3.1.2 The comments are from people across the city and beyond. Within this, there are clusters of comments from some particular local areas. The greatest number of comments are about Ryebank Fields. These are mainly from nearby residents in Chorlton, plus some living over the border in Trafford (Stretford), and elsewhere. There are also particular clusters of comments from people in the city centre, and from the Fallowfield-Rusholme area. The remaining comments are mostly spread out across the remaining various parts of Manchester, with some from neighbouring Greater Manchester (GM) districts, and a small number from further afield. Comments have also been received directly from some Manchester councillors.

3.1.3 The main topics raised by individuals include:

- **Affordable/social housing:** There is a wish to see more affordable/social housing of various types, including in the city centre
- **Biodiversity:** Protection and enhancement of flora and fauna
- **Built heritage:** Heritage should be better protected, citing pressures on city centre buildings from new development
- **City centre:** Mostly arguing for lower density development, or against overdevelopment
- **Climate change:** Many submissions emphasise the importance of tackling the climate emergency. Of these, most are encouraging the Council to do more. There is some scepticism of the growth agenda in general, and growth at the airport in particular.
- **Cycling and walking:** There is support for more and better cycling and walking infrastructure, particularly following the Covid pandemic and the associated move away from public transport use.
- **Delivery of the plan:** The Local Plan should be implemented in practice; some concern/scepticism about whether it will actually happen.
- **Green belt:** Opposition to building in the green belt, particularly around the airport

- **Green spaces:** Support for protection of existing green spaces; calls for more of them in the city centre - a perception that these have been a low priority and that this should change; Covid has shown the need for space for exercise, time with nature, and mental and physical health.
- **HS2:** Generally, opposition to development associated with HS2, and scepticism of the need for it. However, others supported it or made points about maximising growth opportunities that may arise.
- **Manchester Airport:** Mostly opposing further growth due to the impact on the local environment, climate change, and traffic congestion particularly on the motorway network. There is opposition to both the airport itself and nearby associated development including warehousing.
- **Nutsford Vale:** Designate as a country park and retain it as a semi-wild space.
- **Piccadilly Gardens:** Negative perceptions of its physical appearance, and crime/anti-social behaviour in the area
- **Public Space:** There is support for more public spaces, and especially for more green spaces, particularly in the city centre where there is a perceived lack of parks, etc.
- **Ryebank Fields:** There is a large campaign to protect Ryebank Fields in Chorlton from any development. This is by far the single biggest message coming from the consultation. The emails include 247 on the subject of Ryebank Fields. Of these, 245 are opposed to development and two are in favour. The main point is that Ryebank Fields should be protected from development by being designated a Local Green Space. Various arguments are given to support this: the fields are close to local homes and accessible to a large number of local residents; well used by local people for activities including exercise (running, walking), dog walking, children's play, foraging; a haven for wildlife with rich biodiversity; help tackle climate change (carbon capture, etc) and improve local air quality, particularly due to the large number of trees; a unique asset in the urban area, and a change to more managed municipal parks.
- **Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs) and student houses:** Concern over antisocial behaviour such as rubbish and noise, along with a perception that some areas have too many of these types of homes.

3.2 Comments from Landowners and Developers

3.2.1 We received 22 submissions from land/property owners/developers, mostly via a professional agent. They identify their own land/property holdings and make a case for development or protection of them. They are supportive of growth and development in general. The specific points made generally relate to promoting their individual sites and interests.

3.2.2 Some of the main points made are as follows:

- 3.3.3 Most are supportive of the overall vision, particularly regarding growth, vibrancy, and connectivity. Some are supportive of other aspects of the plan such as zero carbon.
- 3.3.4 We received several comments from landowners/developers relating to the city centre area:
 - Several submissions argue for promotion of the visitor economy including hotels, particularly in the city centre.
 - The owner of parts of Piccadilly Gardens indicates they are broadly supportive of improvements in the area.
 - A flexible approach to development in the city centre is needed.
 - The operator of the Manchester Arena argues in favour of the city centre and against out-of-centre development.
 - The owner of much of King St argues for a flexible approach to the use of such sites.
 - Various arguments are put forward in favour of particular types of housing development.
 - Overall, there is support for a variety of housing types, locations, and tenures.
 - The Home Builders Federation “*support the Council in looking to provide a significant increase in housing provision but consider that the objectives should also seek to ensure that sufficient homes are met to meet local needs and to balance with the economic growth.*”
 - Support for affordable housing subject to viability.
 - Respondents with land/property outside the city centre argue for a greater emphasis on regeneration/development of communities outside the centre.
 - The Council should not be setting different targets or policies outside of Building Regulations.

3.3 Comments from Campaigning Organisations

3.3.1 Campaigning organisations seek to increase awareness of their own areas of interest, often with specific suggestions.

3.3.2 The main comments received are as follows:

- A **joint submission** was received from five organisations (**Rising Up! Manchester Families, Climate Emergency Manchester, Greater Manchester Housing Action, Steady State Manchester**). This, or versions of it, was submitted by a large number (around 90) of individual respondents. In addition to specific policy suggestions, points made include:
 - The 'momentous change' of the past decade requires a more radical departure from previous approaches
 - Opposed to development of Manchester Airport due to climate change

- Opposed to the housing growth figures, which they say should be reduced due to 'strain on local infrastructure' and risk of gentrification/'slumification'
- Opposed to the proposed increase in office floor space, which they say should be reduced due to Covid
- Propose prioritising wellbeing and environmental considerations including ecology and energy use
- Prioritise people over cars
- They question growth projections
- They propose 'scenario-based planning' to take account of an unpredictable future
- They say that some of the plan's aims contradict others; growth v carbon neutral, development v green space
- Food Security and supporting biodiversity, and carbon sequestration should be included
- Prioritise reuse of existing buildings over new development
- Affordable housing target is too low, and 'loopholes' allowing developers to avoid contributing should be closed
- They make several other specific policy suggestions.
- **Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA)** are seeking to protect pubs from speculative redevelopment into housing, particularly in the light of the Covid-19 restrictions which are expected to harm the viability of many pubs. They make various suggestions to support the viability of local pubs. They argue for the role of pubs in communities, and tackling loneliness, particularly for older men. They also note the role of 'historic pubs' in Manchester's visitor economy; *"a factor in attracting even more visitors to Manchester is to ensure the preservation and enhancement of its historic public houses."*
- **Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)**; They support the timely adoption of a local plan to avoid 'off-plan' development. They challenge the growth forecasts, including for jobs, industrial and office floorspace requirements. They argue that the housing requirement is overestimated by 15% and request a review using the ONS 2018 data. They opine that *"Manchester is mostly urban, so the Green Belt, rural fringe and green space is immensely important, and it is for everyone's benefit that we write to champion the value of countryside."*
- **Chorlton Voice**; seek a greater focus on neighbourhoods rather than the city centre, are sceptical of the growth agenda and promote quality of life/environment instead, opposed to HS2 and growth at the airport. They make several more detailed policy points.
- **Community-Led Action and Savings Support (CLASS) in alliance with the Greater Manchester Savers network**; argue for much greater emphasis on including disadvantaged

people in the policy development process, suggest a wide range of amendments, and argue for a substantial increase in properties available for social rent.

- **Greater Manchester Trust for Recreation**; support the spatial development proposals, particularly relating to housing in/near district centres. Argue for a stronger focus on the needs of young people. They also promote some of their redundant facilities for development.
- **Levenshulme Clean Air**; “a community group of parents and residents in Levenshulme, calling for healthy air for everyone”. They say that communities in Manchester suffer from illegal levels of air pollution which should be tackled through reducing the need to travel, prioritising active and sustainable modes, and ensuring no new development worsens air pollution. They make several more detailed policy suggestions.
- **Living Streets**; argue for an urban form that facilitates walking and cycling, prioritising people over cars etc, and make many specific points. They support the emphasis on climate change and improving air quality across the city, and the target to become zero-carbon by 2038. They also argue that the Council’s clean air proposals need to be strengthened, particularly to reduce private car use.
- **Macintosh Village Residents Forum**; largely echo the points made in the joint submission, see above.
- **Manchester and Stockport Canal Society**; argue for the protection of the route of the canal from development, so it can be reopened in future
- **Manchester Civic Society** makes a wide variety of comments. They question the validity of underlying assumptions. Amongst other things, they argue for higher importance to be given to the Victoria Park Conservation Area (also see below), industrial heritage embodied in buildings, and better protection for the setting of listed buildings, most importantly the town hall. They also argue for social housing in the city centre and feel that this should not be located separately from the development of which it is part. More generally, they opine that built heritage is not valued enough, and that Manchester’s character is being eroded. They note the loss of listed buildings which they say the Council has apparently chosen not to enforce protection.
- **Manchester Friends of the Earth** have provided a detailed response with several specific policy points. They emphasise that “*the city needs to halve its carbon emissions in the next 5 years and reach zero carbon within the 15-to-20-year timeframe of this plan. And at the same time, we must reverse the decline in nature and green spaces to help the city adapt to the changing climate.*” They provide many specific points in support of this overall goal.
- **Ramblers (Manchester and Salford Ramblers)**; endorse action on climate change as a key issue; opine that new developments should include significant improvements in provision for

walking and cycling; suggest that everyone in Manchester should live no more than a 5-minute walk or 300m from a quality green space; and argue for strong street design standards.

- **Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society** are an active civic group in Fallowfield and Rusholme who have organised a significant number of submissions from local people. They make various suggestions but are mainly aiming for a greater emphasis on the areas outside the city centre. Their comments include:
 - **Housing and Development:** Prioritise family homes over HMOs and flats; focus development on brownfield sites, not Conservation Areas.
 - **Community Balance:** Address the oversupply of takeaways and shisha bars; protect mixed-use neighbourhoods and local shops.
 - **Green Spaces and Biodiversity:** Preserve parks, plant native trees, and support wildlife; avoid overdevelopment of green areas.
 - **Transport and Traffic:** Reduce congestion with better public transport, cycling, and walking infrastructure; manage parking fairly.
 - **Waste Management:** Improve bin storage and collection, especially for HMOs and food businesses, to reduce litter and vermin.
- **Shelter** has provided a detailed response with an analysis of the city's housing/homelessness situation and a policy response to it. They argue: *"Scaled-up delivery of social-rent housing, by both the Council and housing developers, is what is needed to tackle Manchester's housing emergency. It is the only tenure that will provide a genuinely affordable and quality housing option for the many people in the city experiencing homelessness, who are on the council's housing waiting list, as well as many others who are struggling in unaffordable, inappropriate and poor-quality housing in the city... Local Plans have the potential to act as a useful tool for securing the social-rent housing that communities desperately need, particularly from private sector developers."*
- **Schuster Road and Park Range Residents' Association** (Rusholme); argue for a change in the local housing stock away from student accommodation and HMOs, to help facilitate a more settled and stable community. They argue for more social housing in the area. Wilmslow Road shops should be managed to avoid *'an over-supply of restaurants, take-aways and shisha bars at the expense of local shops'*. Trees, parks and green spaces need better protection. The Victoria Park Conservation Area should be managed as a visitor destination, but they suggest it is instead being degraded. They say *"we are proud of our vibrant community, buildings and greenery. We want to share and celebrate Victoria Park with the rest of Manchester and beyond for as many generations to come as possible."*
- **Steady State Manchester** argues for a 'viable economy' particularly to help safeguard the environment - in implied opposition to the Council's growth agenda. They make many specific

points, many echoing the joint submission (see above). Amongst other things they strongly oppose development of the airport due to the impact on climate change. They also argue that the consultation was not fully accessible.

- **Theatres Trust:** Make various points but emphasise that the plan should “*continue to place strong focus on the city’s cultural provision and facilities, including robust policy protecting from loss of valued venues.*” They note that Manchester includes two of the Trust’s ‘Theatres at Risk’: Hulme Hippodrome and Theatre Royal.
- **UK Green Building Council;** supports a commitment to a zero-carbon Manchester by 2038. They make various specific points, including the need to decarbonise heating of buildings. They are supportive of zero-carbon buildings and make points about how this can be achieved. They also argue for stronger biodiversity commitments.

3.4 Comments from Partner Organisations including Specific Consultees

3.4.1 There are many organisations that the Council works with to deliver or coordinate its work. Many of these are government or voluntary organisations and include both local and national organisations. They generally seek to make us aware of any practical or technical issues they consider particularly relevant. We mostly already have close working relationships and joint strategies with them.

3.4.2 ‘Specific Consultees’ are organisations that we are required by law to consult; mostly national agencies, utilities, and neighbouring local authorities. See Appendix 2. Not all provided comments, but they have generally provided comprehensive submissions, at times with technical details. They generally seek to provide practical guidance rather than promoting a particular point of view.

3.4.3 The main comments received are as follows:

- **Canal and River Trust:** Is broadly supportive and makes various specific policy recommendations and comments. They say “*with 96% of land adjacent to waterways outside the Trust’s control, our waterways are vulnerable to the impact of development. We believe however that successful planning policies can help to secure positive place making and high-quality developments which both protect and maximise the opportunities presented by our waterways*”.
- **City of Trees:** Support the plan’s references to the importance and role of Green Infrastructure (GI) in helping to create ‘*a more liveable, sustainable and resilient Manchester*’, but advocate for ‘*a bolder statement of increasing it*’ to ‘*meet the needs of a growing population and help us to adapt to predicted climate change impacts especially flooding.*’ They go on to provide more detailed points on the specific proposals, including:

- **Strategic Alignment:** The Local Plan should link with the GM 5-Year Environment Plan, GM Tree and Woodland Strategy, and GM Resilience Strategy to guide environmental and transport policies.
- **Tree Planting and Air Quality:** Use MappingGM data to target tree planting in areas with poor air quality and along active travel routes to enhance health and accessibility.
- **Green Development:** New developments should include multifunctional green infrastructure (GI) like green roofs, walls, SuDS, and large canopy trees to support climate resilience and biodiversity.
- **GI as Critical Infrastructure:** Green infrastructure must be prioritised equally with grey infrastructure from the outset of planning, not treated as an afterthought.
- **Design Standards:** Local Plan policies should reference best practice and standards for GI, including guidance from GM Tree Strategy, CIRIA SuDS Manual, and green roof/wall guides.
- **Environmental Equity:** Ensure all communities have access to quality green space. Review existing green spaces for potential to enhance climate resilience and air quality.
- **City Centre Greening:** Boost the city's appeal and economy by increasing tree canopy and integrating GI in the city centre to create a more attractive environment.
- **Evidence-Based Protection:** Use ecosystem service assessments to determine whether existing GI should be retained or replaced when development is proposed.
- **Robust Evidence Base:** Support natural environment and climate policies with data from the GM Natural Capital Account, GM Environment Plan, and GM Tree and Woodland Strategy.
- **Coal Authority:** No comments at this stage
- **Department for Education (UK Government):** They note that local education authorities must ensure sufficient school places, including at sixth form, and have a key role in securing contributions from development to new education infrastructure. They support the use of planning obligations to secure developer contributions for education. They say that the next version of the Local Plan should seek to identify specific sites which can deliver the school places needed to support growth.
- **Environment Agency:** Broadly support the proposals and give a large number of specific policy points. They say they are *“pleased with the current scope and issues identified for the forthcoming plan, in particular the commitment to improve green spaces/infrastructure and achieve carbon neutrality through sustainable development.”* Some of main points are as follows:
 - **Ecosystem Services and River Networks:** The importance of Manchester's river networks for delivering environmental and social benefits.

- **Natural Connectivity:** Manchester's waterways connect places and people, offering sustainable transport routes that should be enhanced for walking and cycling.
- **Neighbourhood-Specific Comments:**
 - **Northern Area:** Support for recognising the Irk Valley and open spaces, with a recommendation to also focus on the River Irk and River Medlock.
 - **Central Area:** Emphasis on protecting and enhancing the River Irk and Medlock, including daylighting and preventing overshadowing by new developments.
- **Surface Water Management:** In Manchester's urban areas, surface water management is a critical issue that should be addressed through sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS).
- **Environmental Challenges by Area:** Suggestion to identify key environmental challenges specific to each Manchester neighbourhood in future iterations of the Local Plan.
- **Zero-Carbon Target:** Manchester's Local Plan should prioritise energy efficiency and sustainable technologies in both new and existing developments to meet the 2038 zero-carbon goal.
- **Multiple Environmental Benefits:** New and existing developments in Manchester should deliver measurable improvements in biodiversity, water quality, and flood risk management.
- **Alignment with Regional Strategies:** The Local Plan should align with the Greater Manchester Strategic Framework and Environment Bill to support sustainable development.
- **Highways England:** Provide detailed considerations and request further dialogue to *'understand the current transport provision, alongside individual and cumulative transport and highway traffic impacts associated with any proposed site allocations likely to impact the SRN.'* In particular, they highlight the area around Manchester Airport and the proposed location of the HS2 station adjacent to M56 Junction 5 as locations of interest.
- **Historic England:** Disagrees with the draft vision and questions the underlying assumptions/evidence base. They provide various points about the role of heritage and how it can support the wider objectives of the plan and the city. They say that the profile of heritage in all areas of the plan needs to be increased. Policies should *"engage with heritage in terms of its potential for place making as well as offering clear and positive direction that will support the conservation and restoration of heritage assets at risk, opportunities to gain maximum public value and the need to engage with heritage and local character early in the policy making and design processes."* They make many specific comments on the various proposals, however some of their key criticisms include:

- The Local Plan must be based on current evidence about the historic environment.
- Heritage impact assessments should accompany all proposed sites.
- The NPPF requires assessing the significance of heritage assets and their settings.
- Evidence should include local character and historic landscape. Without this, heritage assets and local distinctiveness may be harmed or lost.
- A strong evidence base helps protect and enhance Manchester's historic identity.
- **Homes England:** Have not provided detailed comments, but state *"The housing ambitions within this Issues Consultation are noted. The Housing Infrastructure Fund allocation recently announced for Manchester supports the delivery of this and we are keen to continue to work with you to fulfil your housing growth ambitions."*
- **Greater Manchester Minerals and Waste Team:** Welcome the statement that materials and waste will need to come from a new circular economy, involving the reuse and recycling of materials already in circulation, and significantly increased use of sustainable and renewable materials.
- **Manchester Airports Group:** Supports the proposals, which they say *'recognises the importance and scale of benefits that Manchester Airport provides to the city'*. They argue for *'a greater focus on the provision of transport infrastructure (across all modes) to support the airport, the Airport Gateway and Airport City'* which would, they say, *'enhance the area's accessibility and help ensure that all of Greater Manchester and the site allocations can capitalise on the economic and employment benefits that the Airport brings'*.
- **Manchester City Council - Work and Skills Team:** While they support the vision, they say the objectives should be strengthened by making a clearer link to the inclusive growth/inclusive economy agenda to ensure that growth is sustainable and beneficial to Manchester's residents and communities, rather than being an end in itself. They go on to provide more detailed comments in support of this view.
- **Manchester Climate Change Agency:** Suggest the inclusion of: *'Development will be planned to ensure that its location helps to keep Manchester's direct CO2 emissions (from buildings and transport) within a limited carbon budget and that all aviation emissions from Manchester Airport are consistent with the Paris Agreement, as part of a UK aviation strategy'*.
- **Ringway Parish Council:** Oppose the proposals for growth at and around the airport. They say: *"The current Core Strategy has placed too much emphasis on 'the growth of Manchester Airport' 'as a catalyst for the regional economy'. The over development of Manchester Airport formerly Ringway Airport has caused untold devastation to Ringway Parish and other Manchester communities living in its shadow."*
- **Manchester College (LTE Group):** Opine that there should be more of a focus on the areas outside the city centre.

- **National Grid:** Advise of the location of specific assets, at Heaton Park and the Mersey Valley.
- **Network Rail:** Request protection of existing rail freight facilities at nine sites (not all within the MCC area) and say they are concerned about the ability of our stations and infrastructure to cope with the extra number of people expected/encouraged by the local plan. They request ‘commensurate infrastructure funding / developer contributions’.
- **NHS:**
 - **Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust:** Detailed comments submitted with regard to North Manchester General Hospital, Crumpsall. They outline “*how the exciting and unparalleled regeneration of the NMGH site can transform it into an integrated and vibrant healthcare-hub*”. Further details on their other hospital sites may follow at later stages of the plan process.
 - **NHS Property Services Ltd.:** Substantial rebuilding and expansion of hospital and other health facilities is expected, with potentially some funding using S106/CIL.
- **Sport England:** broadly agree with the Vision and Objectives but feel the health and wellbeing element can be strengthened and provide several detailed policy points to support this. They also state: “*It is strongly advised to avoid the use of local standards for outdoor sport and instead include a policy for obtaining developer contributions. Sport England has been working ... to help the Council prepare a process for calculating appropriate contributions for sport based on the evidence and to link that to a Local Plan policy.*”
- **Trans Pennine Trail:** Generally support the proposals, particularly around sustainable transport.
- **United Utilities:** Broadly supportive; wish to engage early on particular large sites and proposals; support the sustainability proposals, particularly regarding surface water and drainage (climate change).

4. Next Steps

4.1 The next steps of the process of developing the Local Plan are set out below. The dates of these are subject to change.

1. A final draft of the Manchester Local Plan (‘Reg 18’) is being published in September 2025, followed by a period of eight weeks of public consultation.
2. Following this consultation, a final version of the plan will be prepared.
3. A final plan will be published for a formal statutory consultation (reg 19).
4. Submission to Secretary of State
5. Examination of the plan
6. Adoption of Manchester Local Plan

5. Consideration of comments in preparation of the draft plan

5.1 The comments we have received, as described above, have informed the work that has taken place to write the first draft of the Manchester Local Plan. This revised plan is now available for public consideration. All issues raised by the consultation were considered in the drafting of the plan. Some issues raised may not appear in the proposed policy for the following reasons:

- Comments are not relevant to planning
- Comments about very specific areas may have been reflected more generally in strategic policies
- Matters raised are covered by the Places for Everyone Joint Plan or Greater Manchester Waste and Mineral plans. We don't need to duplicate policy already established elsewhere.
- Matters raised are already covered elsewhere in the planning policy framework. This includes national policy such as the National Planning Policy Framework and National Aviation Policy.

5.2 The vision and objectives have been updated to reflect the Our Manchester Strategy as the vision for the draft Local Plan is the same as that in the Our Manchester Strategy.

6. Policy Responses to Issues Raised

Note that some issues and policy responses are also dealt with in the Places for Everyone (PfE) plan.

SUBJECT AREA	TOPIC	ISSUES RAISED	POLICY / RESPONSE
Overall vision	Growth; too much or not enough	Some say the growth envisaged is excessive; others say there should be more. Those saying growth is excessive are mostly arguing from an environmental point-of-view, particularly re net zero carbon.	Requirements for housing and employment set out in PfE. SP1 Spatial Principles SP2 Development Principles SGL1 Strategic Growth Locations

SUBJECT AREA	TOPIC	ISSUES RAISED	POLICY / RESPONSE
	A view that there are contradictory goals: growth v net zero, development v green space		SP1 Spatial Principles SP2 Development Principles The plan aims to balance various objectives and ensure consideration of several principles.
	Prioritise reuse of existing buildings over new development		The plan seeks to meet NPPF and makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or 'brownfield' land and where necessary makes provision for new buildings.
Spatial principles	Land/property outside the city centre	Support for regeneration of communities outside the centre	C3 District Centres H1 Housing Provision SGL1 Strategic Growth Locations SGL4 Victoria North SGL5 Holt Town SGL6 Sportcity SGL7 Central Park (North) SGL8 Strangeways SGL9 North Manchester General Hospital SGL10 Wythenshawe Centre and Adjacent Areas SGL11 Wythenshawe Hospital SGL12 MIX – Manchester Airport

SUBJECT AREA	TOPIC	ISSUES RAISED	POLICY / RESPONSE
			SGL13 Manchester Airport Strategic Site SP1 Spatial Principles
	Urban form that facilitates walking and cycling, prioritising people over cars		T2 Sustainable location of development
Economy	Visitor economy including hotels	Should be promoted, particularly in the city centre	C11 Hotels and Other Visitor Accommodation SGL2 City Centre SGL City Centre Areas
	Office space	Opposition to increase, due to impact of Covid on working patterns.	Not taken forward as office requirement set out in PfE.
	Pubs	Protect pubs from speculative redevelopment into housing	C1 Centre Hierarchy C2 City Centre Retail C3 District Centres C9 Leisure Developments
Housing	Affordable/social housing	There is a wish to see more affordable/social housing of various types, including in the city centre. Developers say it should be 'viable'.	H2 Affordable Housing
		Social housing should be delivered in the city centre.	H2 Affordable Housing
	Housing development		H1 Housing Provision SP1 Spatial Principles
	Housing types, locations, and tenures.	Housebuilders / landowners argue for various types of new	H1 Housing Provision SP1 Spatial Principles

SUBJECT AREA	TOPIC	ISSUES RAISED	POLICY / RESPONSE
		housing. Support for a variety of housing types, locations, and tenures.	
	Increase in housing provision	Provision should meet both local need and growth.	PfE sets level of housing provision H1 Housing Provision SP1 Spatial Principles
Housing	Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs)	Concern over antisocial behaviour such as rubbish and noise, along with a perception that some areas have too many of these types of homes.	H8 Houses in Multiple Occupation
	Student houses	Concern over antisocial behaviour such as rubbish and noise, along with a perception that some areas have too many of these types of homes.	H5 Purpose Built Student Accommodation Some types of student accommodation do not require specific planning permission
Heritage	Built heritage	Heritage should be better protected	D4 Supported Housing D5 Purpose Built Student Accommodation
		Pressures on city centre buildings from new development	D4 Supported Housing D5 Purpose Built Student Accommodation
		Protection for industrial heritage embodied in buildings	D4 D5 Purpose Built Student Accommodation

SUBJECT AREA	TOPIC	ISSUES RAISED	POLICY / RESPONSE
		Better protection for the setting of listed buildings.	D4 Supported Housing
Environment	Biodiversity	Protection and enhancement of flora and fauna	SP1 Spatial Principles EN1 Strategic Green and Blue Infrastructure EN2 River Valleys and Waterways EN3 Trees and Woodlands EN4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity EN5 Biodiversity Net Gain EN6 Urban Green Factor
	Climate change / net zero carbon	Many submissions emphasise the importance of tackling the climate emergency. Of these, most are encouraging the Council to do more. There is some scepticism of the growth agenda in general, and growth at the airport in particular.	ZC1 Sustainable Design and Construction ZC2 Towards Net Zero Carbon ZC3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Developments ZC4 Heat Networks
	Local air quality	Air pollution should be tackled through reducing the need to travel, prioritising active and sustainable	EN7 Air Quality

SUBJECT AREA	TOPIC	ISSUES RAISED	POLICY / RESPONSE
		modes, and ensuring no new development worsens air pollution	
	Green spaces	Support for protection of existing green spaces; calls for more of them in the city centre - a perception that these have been a low priority and that this should change; Covid has shown the need for space for exercise, time with nature, and mental and physical health.	EN1 Strategic Green and Blue Infrastructure EN2 River Valleys and Waterways EN3 Trees and Woodlands
	Surface Water Management	Surface water management should be addressed through sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS).	EN1 Strategic Green and Blue Infrastructure EN2 River Valleys and Waterways EN6 Urban Green Factor EN9 Flood Risk SGL2 Manchester City Centre
	Waterways (connectivity)	Waterways should be used as sustainable transport routes	EN1 Strategic Green and Blue Infrastructure
Transport	Cycling and Walking	There is support for more and better cycling and walking infrastructure, particularly following the Covid pandemic and the associated move away from public transport use.	SP1 Spatial Principles T1 Transport Principles T2 Sustainable location of development T3 Infrastructure Investment

SUBJECT AREA	TOPIC	ISSUES RAISED	POLICY / RESPONSE
			ZC1 Sustainable Design and Construction
	Transport hierarchy	Prioritise people over cars	T1 Transport Principles T3 Infrastructure Investment
Transport	HS2	Generally, opposition to development associated with HS2, and scepticism of the need for it. However, others supported it or made points about maximising growth opportunities that may arise.	No longer applicable as HS2 not going forward as previously planned.
Airport		Mostly opposing further growth due to the impact on the local environment, climate change, and traffic congestion particularly on the motorway network. There is opposition to both the airport itself and nearby associated development including warehousing.	Airport growth dealt with by national Aviation policy. Specific policies: DM7 Aviation Noise DM8 Manchester Airport Public Safety DM9 Aerodrome Safeguarding SGL12 MIX – Manchester Airport SGL13 Manchester Airport Strategic Site
	Traffic on motorway network near airport	Proposed location of the HS2 station adjacent to M56 Junction 5	Not applicable as HS2 cancelled
Particular places	City centre	Various comments arguing for higher or lower density, mix of	C1 Centre Hierarchy C2 City Centre Retail

SUBJECT AREA	TOPIC	ISSUES RAISED	POLICY / RESPONSE
		uses, environmental improvements, against overdevelopment, etc.	SGL2 Manchester City Centre SGL3 City Centre Areas
		City centre should see lower density development	Not taken forward as NPPF seeks to make as much use as possible of previously developed land. PfE identifies the City Centre as generally for high density.
	Manchester Arena (Victoria)	Owner argues against out-of-centre development	C8 Out-of-centre Development C9 Leisure Developments SGL3 City Centre Areas The policy framework envisages the success of both Manchester arena in the city centre and the Coop arena at Eastlands.
	King St	Owner advocates a flexible planning framework	Covered by other policies (NPPF, city centre and development management)
	Ryebank Fields	Ryebank Fields should be protected from development by being designated a Local Green Space	No specific policy. Review of Local Green Space submissions on-going.

SUBJECT AREA	TOPIC	ISSUES RAISED	POLICY / RESPONSE
	Nutsford Vale	Designate as a country park and retain it as a semi-wild space.	No specific policy, but can be considered within other policies
	Manchester and Stockport Canal (route)	Protection of the route of the canal from development, so it can be reopened in future	No specific policy but covered by EN2 River Valleys and Waterways
	Victoria Park	Higher importance should be given to the Victoria Park Conservation Area	Covered by heritage policies and conservation area framework.
	Victoria North		SGL1 Strategic Growth Locations SGL4 Victoria North
	North Manchester General Hospital (Crumpsall)	'The exciting and unparalleled regeneration of the NMGH site can transform it into an integrated and vibrant healthcare-hub'	SGL9 North Manchester General Hospital
	South Manchester	Retain character, invest in local centres	C1 Centre Hierarchy C6 South Manchester District Centre C7 Local Centres
	Rusholme	Over-supply of restaurants, take-aways and shisha bars at the expense of local shop	Covered by change of use national policy
		Trees, parks and green spaces need better protection.	SI1 Protection of existing Open Space, Sport and Recreation land and facilities.

SUBJECT AREA	TOPIC	ISSUES RAISED	POLICY / RESPONSE
			Also covered by conservation area structures, tree preservation orders, etc.
	Public space	There is support for more public spaces, and especially for more green spaces, particularly in the city centre where there is a perceived lack of parks, etc.	DC1 Developer Contributions SI2 Provision of new Open Space, Sport and Recreation land and facilities
Development management	Building regulations	Plan shouldn't impose different targets or policies outside of Building Regulations	In specific circumstances planning policy can consider standards above Building Regulations if justified.
	City centre	A flexible approach is needed	DM1 Development Management DM5 Shop Fronts and Related Signs SGL2 Manchester City Centre SGL3 City Centre Areas
Delivery of the plan		The Local Plan should be implemented in practice; some concern/scepticism about whether it will actually happen.	The plan has been carefully written to be deliverable.
	Planning contributions	Use S106 and similar to obtain public infrastructure	DC1 Developer Contributions

SUBJECT AREA	TOPIC	ISSUES RAISED	POLICY / RESPONSE
		Use of planning obligations to secure developer contributions for education	DC1 Developer Contributions

7. Appendices

7.1 Appendix One - Statement from the MCC News and Media Team

Manchester's major review of its Local Plan begins

The overarching plan that sets out the key guidelines for all development across the city will be reviewed - and the first eight week consultation is underway.

The new Local Plan will provide a set of principles that will underpin new development over the next 15-20 years and will replace the city's current Core Strategy.

The first step of the new Local Plan is to speak to Manchester people and businesses on issues important to them that will inform the principles of the new Local Plan, and highlight key themes for the plan to focus on.

You can read about and comment on our online issues consultation, view a hard copy in the Central Library, or call in at one of our Local Plan events. These are being held on:

- Monday 17 February, 3pm to 7pm at Withington Baths and Leisure Centre
- Wednesday 19 February, 3pm to 7pm at Abraham Moss Centre
- Monday 24 February, 3pm to 7pm at North City Library, Harpurhey
- Wednesday 26 February, 3pm to 7pm at Wythenshawe Forum
- Thursday 27 February, 12noon to 4.30pm at Inspire Centre, Levenshulme
- Monday 2 March, 12noon to 6.30pm at Central Library

The public and businesses will be able to take part in further consultation opportunities throughout the process.

A draft plan is expected to be prepared by winter 2020/21 for public consultation.

A final plan will be published in summer/autumn of 2021 for a formal statutory consultation, ahead of submission to the Secretary of State.

This is the first major review of the city's development plan since 2012 and will help respond to a range of emerging strategic issues, such as housing demand, transport infrastructure, neighbourhoods that promote healthy lifestyles, and achieving a zero carbon Manchester by 2038.

The Local Plan should ensure new building and investment is aligned to Manchester's growth ambitions and meets the city's high development standards. And as the city's population continues to grow (expected to hit 635,000 by 2025), it's crucial that the city's growth continues to be as inclusive and sustainable as possible.

The Local Plan will also take into account the Our Manchester Strategy, the emerging Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF), the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Greater Manchester's new devolved planning powers.

Cllr Angeliki Stogia, Manchester City Council's executive member for environment, planning and transport, said: "Developing a new Local Plan is a vital process that will shape where new homes will be built, where new employment opportunities will be created, what amenities are needed - such as schools and healthcare - and the transport infrastructure that connect the entire city.

"This is a plan that will touch all of our lives in the next two decades, so we are keen to hear from as many people as possible about the issues they face - as well as potential options to improve them - and make sure everyone has a chance to shape our city. So please have your say."

MEDIA CONTACT

Simon Walker

0161 234 1010

s.walker2@manchester.gov.uk

7.2 Appendix Two – Consultees

7.2.1 Equalities groups:

- Age Concern
- Age Friendly Manchester and Older People's Board
- BME People Network
- Broad African Representative Council
- Diversity plus
- Faith Action
- Faith Communities Network
- Irish Community Care
- LGBT foundation
- Manchester Carers' Forum
- Manchester Deaf Centre
- Manchester Disabled People's Access Group
- Manchester Failsworth Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses
- Manchester Jewish Housing Association
- Manchester Race and Health Forum
- National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
- Pankhurst Centre
- Valuing Older People
- Voluntary Youth Manchester
- Wai Yin Chinese Women Society
- White Moss Youth Club
- Women's Design Group
- Young Advisors

7.2.2 Specific Consultees:

- Cadent
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Electricity North West
- Environment Agency
- Highways Authorities (GM Local Authorities)
- Highways England

- Historic England
- Homes England
- Local Enterprise Partnership
- Local Nature Partnership (Natural Capital Group)
- Mayor of GM / GMCA
- National Grid
- NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups (NHS Foundation Trust)
- NHS Commissioning Board
- Natural England
- Neighbouring Authorities: Bury, Rochdale, Oldham, Tameside, Stockport, Cheshire East, Trafford, Salford
- Network Rail
- Office of Rail Regulation
- Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM)
- United Utilities

7.3 Appendix Three – Display Boards

This section contains three full-page images of display boards that were used at public events as part of the consultation process. The boards contain blocks of text, and three pictures which are decorative.

The first display board shows a picture of Manchester city centre and skyline. The Manchester City Council logo is displayed. The title is “Have your say: Planning Manchester’s development for the next 15 years”. Underneath the picture is written “To find out more about the issues and how the local plan will be produced, visit our website: www.manchester.gov.uk/localplan

The second display board has two pictures and two blocks of text. One picture is of a yellow Manchester tram with people on the platform at Victoria station. The second is a photograph of the lake at Heaton Park with trees and geese.

The first block of text reads as follows:

Manchester Local Plan summary of issues

Key Issues

Action on climate change:

- Policies that help meet our zero-carbon target by 2038 at the latest

Balancing demand for space:

- Deciding where to build homes that link to where jobs will be
- Determining where schools, health centres and green spaces should be.

Getting around:

- Planning on how we move around the city in the future.

Utilities

- Delivering essential water, sewerage, power and digital services.

Creating healthy places:

- Designing places that help to keep people healthy.

The second block of text reads as follows:

Other Issues

Economy:

- Creating jobs people need for a healthier, more equal Manchester
- Building on our strengths in our universities, hospitals, digital and creative sectors.

City centre:

- Balancing the need for jobs, homes and sustainable transport
- Managing the growth of the city centre

Places to live:

- Deciding on the types of housing we will need
- Looking at the district centres in the city and their role
- Thinking about where new shops, schools, health and care community facilities and open spaces might be needed.

Healthy environment:

- Cleaning up our air
- Dealing with flood risk
- Protecting green spaces and waterways
- Supporting wildlife and biodiversity.

The third display board outlines the stages in the plan process. It starts with a heading reading “Have your say: Planning Manchester’s development for the next 15 years – What happens next?”

This is followed by a graphic showing six stages, with the following text:

Issues Consultation	Asking what should go into the new Local Plan
Draft Local Plan	Writing a first draft of the Local Plan and asking for comments on it.
Publication Local Plan	Writing the final draft of the Local Plan and asking for comments on it.
Submission of the Local Plan	We hand the Local Plan over to Government for the Examination Stage.
Examination of the Local Plan	The Local Plan will be examined by a Planning Inspector
Adoption of the Local Plan	The final version of the Local Plan is agreed by the Council.

Have your say:
Planning Manchester's
development for the next 15 years



To find out more about the issues and how the local plan will be produced, visit our website:
www.manchester.gov.uk/localplan

Manchester Local Plan summary of issues

Key issues

Action on climate change:

- Policies that help meet our zero-carbon target by 2038 at the latest.

Balancing demand for space:

- Deciding where to build homes that link to where jobs will be
- Determining where schools, health centres and green spaces should be

Getting around:

- Planning on how we move around the city in the future

Utilities:

- Delivering essential water, sewerage, power and digital services.

Creating healthy places:

- Designing places that help to keep people healthy.



Other issues

Economy:

- Creating jobs people need for a healthier, more equal Manchester
- Building on our strengths in our universities, hospitals, digital and creative sectors.

City centre:

- Balancing the need for jobs, homes and sustainable transport
- Managing the growth of the city centre.

Places to live:

- Deciding on the types of housing we will need
- Looking at the district centres in the city and their role
- Thinking about where new shops, schools, health and care community facilities and open spaces might be needed.

Healthy environment:

- Cleaning up our air
- Dealing with flood risk
- Protecting green spaces and waterways
- Supporting wildlife and biodiversity.

Have your say:

Planning Manchester's development for the next 15 years
– What happens next?

Issues Consultation

Asking what should go into the new Local Plan.

Draft Local Plan

Writing a first draft of the Local Plan and asking for comments on it.



Publication Local Plan

Writing the final draft of the Local Plan and asking for comments on it.



Submission of the Local Plan

We hand the Local Plan over to Government for the Examination Stage.



Examination of the Local Plan

The Local Plan will be examined by a Planning Inspector.



Adoption of the Local Plan

The final version of the Local Plan is agreed by the Council.

