

**Manchester City Council
Report for Resolution**

Report To: Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee –19 July 2016
Executive – 27 July 2016

Subject: Neighbourhood Planning in the Castlefield area – Designation of a Neighbourhood Area

Report of: Deputy Chief Executive (Growth and Neighbourhoods)

Summary

The Localism Act 2011 introduced new planning provisions enabling designated Neighbourhood Forums to prepare planning policies for a designated Neighbourhood Area, for consideration by the relevant local authority and by an independent examiner.

The Council has received an application to designate a Neighbourhood Area in Castlefield. This report makes recommendations regarding the determination of this application. It should be read alongside the Council's general approach to Neighbourhood Planning, as included elsewhere on this committee agenda.

Of particular importance and set out in the report is the strategic role of the City Centre in terms of growth and the how this must be the context for assessing the suitability of the proposed Neighbourhood Area.

Recommendation

- 1, That Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee comment on the content of the report
 - 2 That Executive refuse the area specified in the application and instead designate the area shown on the attached map in Appendix 1 as the Castlefield Neighbourhood Area and agrees that the designated area should not be designated as a business area.
-

Wards Affected: City Centre and Hulme

Manchester Strategy outcomes	Summary of the contribution to the strategy
A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities	The Neighbourhood Area is the first step in the production of a Neighbourhood Development Plan for an area. Such plans should aim to promote and improve Castlefield for the benefit of businesses, conserve and enhance the area's heritage assets, and help to deliver high quality residential developments. The proposed area has been amended to help ensure these aims are promoted rather than potentially restricted.
A highly skilled city: world class and home grown talent sustaining the city's economic success	Well-planned development can support delivery of training and employment opportunities.
A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities	Neighbourhood planning processes encourage residents to get involved and influence decision-making.
A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work	The neighbourhood plan should encourage local residents to take ownership of their area and help ensure it develops as an attractive, sustainable part of the City Centre.
A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth	Well-planned development can make the most of the connections within an area.

Full details are in the body of the report, along with any implications for:

- Equal Opportunities Policy
- Risk Management
- Legal Considerations

Financial Consequences – Revenue

There are no direct financial costs arising from the designation of a Neighbourhood Area for the Castlefield area.

However, once designated, the Neighbourhood Forum (if and when applied for and appointed) may prepare Neighbourhood Development Plans and Neighbourhood Development Orders, which would be submitted to the Council who must publicise these and carry out a consultation process. The Council will also have to bear the costs of independent examination of any Neighbourhood Development Plan / Development Order, and eventually of the referendum required by the Localism Act prior to adoption of such plans and orders. Whilst there is some financial support available from the Government to cover these costs, it is likely that there will need to be a contribution from the Council. It is anticipated that costs would be in the region

of £10-15,000, although the extent to which these fall on the Council would depend on the level of government grant received.

The Council is legally required to provide support and advice to Neighbourhood Forums throughout the preparation process for Neighbourhood Development Plans and Neighbourhood Development Orders. Whilst the 'Duty to Support' does not require the Council to provide financial assistance to neighbourhood forums, there will be resource implications in terms of staff time.

Financial Consequences – Capital

None

Contact Officers:

Name: Richard Elliott
Position: Head of Policy, Partnerships and Research
Telephone: 0161 219 6494
E-mail: r.elliott@manchester.gov.uk

Name: James Shuttleworth
Position: Planning Strategy Manager
Telephone: 0161 234 4594
Email: j.shuttleworth@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Pat Bartoli
Position: Head of City Centre Regeneration Team
Telephone: 0161 234 3329
Email: p.bartoli@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Julie Roscoe
Position: Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing
Telephone: 0161 234 4552
Email: j.roscoe@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents (available for public inspection):

The following documents disclose important facts on which the report is based and have been relied upon in preparing the report. Copies of the background documents are available up to 4 years after the date of the meeting. If you would like a copy please contact one of the contact officers above.

- Castlefield Neighbourhood Area Application

1. Introduction

- 1.1 In January 2016, the Council received an application to designate a Neighbourhood Area in Castlefield for Neighbourhood Planning purposes. The Council's overall approach to Neighbourhood Planning is set out in a report elsewhere on this committee's agenda. This report should be considered in that context. It considers the application for Castlefield within Manchester's policy framework, summarises the consultation responses received, and recommends the designation of an alternative area to the one applied for, setting out the reasons behind this recommendation.

2. Castlefield Neighbourhood Area Application

- 2.1 In January 2016 an organisation called the Castlefield Forum submitted an application for the designation of a Neighbourhood Area. The area applied for covers parts of both the City Centre and Hulme wards. It is shown at Appendix 1. This is a very large area, broadly bounded by the River Irwell, Chester Road, Albion St, Deansgate, and Quay St. It includes a substantial part of the City Centre, including important heritage assets and development sites.
- 2.2 The area applied for does not currently have a designated Neighbourhood Forum (for neighbourhood planning purposes), nor are there any pending applications for a Neighbourhood Forum.
- 2.3 The application contains a document explaining how the applicants decided the geographical boundaries of the area proposed. This is included at Appendix 2. To summarise, the applicant's case is as follows:
- The Castlefield and St John St Conservation Areas provide the base position, as these had 'previously been designated by MCC for their distinctive features, with these areas having a historical and physical connection based on land use and building type'.
 - They also considered that parts of the area are covered by residents groups (Castlefield Forum, St Johns St, and Britannia Mills)
 - Physical features were used to form the boundaries.
- 2.4 The applicants comprise community groups whose memberships broadly cover the application area. The area covered by these groups is large, comprising a number of distinct neighbourhoods.

3. Policy Framework

- 3.1 This report should be considered within the overall Manchester approach to Neighbourhood Planning, as set out in the executive report *Manchester City Council Policy Framework for Neighbourhood Planning*.
- 3.2 The existing planning policy framework for the Castlefield area is set out in the Council's Core Strategy as well as in 'saved' Unitary Development Plan policies (particularly policy RC20 areas 27 & 28). Manchester's Core Strategy in Policy CC3 (Housing) states that the City Centre will see the most

intensive development of housing in the City and names Castlefield as a key location for residential development. The area includes sites covered by regeneration frameworks for St Johns (including the former ITV/Granada site), Water Street, and Cornbrook. Although these are non-statutory, they have been consulted upon and subsequently endorsed by the Council, and are material considerations for planning purposes.

- 3.3 Extensive consultation has taken place during the development of these frameworks. For example, in relation to the St John's development framework consultation letters were sent out to over 3,600 local residents and businesses, informing them about the public consultation, how to participate, and engage in the consultation process, and where to access the Framework document. The St John's Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) was made available on the Council's website, and comments were invited on this. Statutory agencies were also invited to comment including English Heritage, Transport for Greater Manchester and the Museum of Science and Industry. In addition to this there was further engagement with local residents and other stakeholders through drop in sessions, presentations and leaflet drops.

4 Consultation

- 4.1 The Council consulted on the application between 7th March and 25th April 2016. During this time the application and supporting information was published on the Council's website, and paper copies of the documents were available in Central Library. Stakeholders on the Council's planning policy database were notified by letter or email. Site notices were posted at locations within the proposed Neighbourhood Area, including at Cornbrook, Ellesmere St, Castlefield basin, Liverpool Road, Quay St, St John's Gardens, Peter St, and St John's St.
- 4.2 The consultation generated a significant level of interest. 165 submissions from interested local residents, and others, were received. Of these, 151 are in favour of the boundary applied for, one opposes the application, six suggest a smaller area, and seven are from organisations not expressing a view on the boundary. A full schedule of responses is included in Appendix 2.
- The majority of the submissions were supportive of the application as a whole and/or the area applied for. These are mainly from residents within the proposed Neighbourhood Area, who suggest that their areas function as part of Castlefield, and have close links to the rest of the area applied for.
 - One comment has been received which opposes the application as unnecessary; however, while the Council can designate a different area from that applied for, legislation does not allow it to refuse a valid application outright.
 - Six submissions have argued for a smaller area than that applied for. These are mostly from landowners, who make various arguments supporting a view that the area should be reduced to a more central element of Castlefield. This suggests some reluctance from some key local stakeholders to be part of the Neighbourhood Planning process.
 - The Council also consulted organisations through the standard

planning process. This generated a number of comments from statutory providers and others; these are summarised as follows:

- The Environment Agency, United Utilities, Canal & River Trust did not make specific comments at this stage but will be kept in touch as things progress and may comment on later stages.
- Historic England are “content with the consultation process and results of this to include the indicated areas beyond the Castlefield Conservation Area.” They also draw attention to the need to consider the area’s heritage assets when a neighbourhood plan is prepared.
- National Grid, Network Rail and Sport England have made various comments relevant to the preparation of a neighbourhood plan which is likely to follow at a later stage.

5 Assessment of the Neighbourhood Area Application

5.1 This section considers the application with regard to the necessary legal and policy frameworks.

National Requirements and Guidance

5.2 The relevant Act states that in determining a neighbourhood area application a local authority must have regard to the desirability of maintaining the whole of the area of a parish council as a neighbourhood area, and to the desirability of maintaining the existing boundaries of areas already designated as neighbourhood areas. This is not relevant in this particular instance.

5.3 The Act also states that when a local planning authority designates an area as a Neighbourhood Area it must consider whether it should be designated as a business area. It further goes on to state that this should only be done in situations where the authority considers that the area is wholly or predominantly business in nature. The Royal Town Planning Institute’s Planning Aid Service has produced support tools for community groups and local authorities on its Neighbourhood Planning website. This resource provides examples of the types of area that could be considered wholly or predominantly used for business, suggesting that examples include “industrial estates, business parks or town centres”. It is considered that due to the number of residential properties compared to businesses in the Neighbourhood Area to be designated that this is not an area “wholly or predominantly business in nature”, so should not, therefore, be designated as a business area.

5.4 There is also provision in the Act to refuse an application. A local authority can do so if they consider that the specified area is not an appropriate area for designation, however, the requirement is that it must designate an area that includes at least part of the area applied for. This would imply that the test for designation of an area is that it is “an appropriate area to be designated”. Although guidance on this matter appears to be directed at prospective forums, it could also be used by councils when considering whether the boundary applied for is “appropriate”. This guidance states that the following

could be considerations when deciding the boundaries of a Neighbourhood Area:

- a. Village or settlement boundaries, which could reflect areas of planned expansion
- b. The catchment area for walking to local services such as shops, primary schools, doctors' surgeries, parks or other facilities
- c. The area where formal or informal networks of community based groups operate
- d. The physical appearance or characteristics of the neighbourhood, for example buildings may be of a consistent scale or style
- e. Whether the area forms all or part of a coherent estate either for businesses or residents
- f. Whether the area is wholly or predominantly a business area
- g. Whether infrastructure or physical features define a natural boundary, for example a major road or railway line or waterway
- h. The natural setting or features in an area
- i. Size of the population (living and working) in the area with electoral wards being suggested as a useful starting point for discussions as these have an average of 5,500 residents

Officers consider that the most relevant criteria for the Castlefield application are d, e, g and i.

5.5 The guidance also states that local planning authorities should take into account the statement provided by the relevant body (i.e. the prospective forum) explaining why the area applied for is considered appropriate to be designated.

5.6 The applicant's rationale for the proposed area does not reflect key points within the guidance as listed above. In particular, the proposed Neighbourhood Area includes a number of different districts (criteria d and e above), distinct from each other due to their physical appearance and characteristics:

- The Castlefield Basin area at the core of Castlefield is characterised by transport infrastructure (railways and canals) and converted industrial heritage buildings, alongside complementary infill development and the Roman Fort area.
- The former Granada site is due to be redeveloped into a mixed - use district, which will have closer links to Spinningfields than to Castlefield.
- Ellesmere Street and Cornbrook are currently characterised by industrial and business uses, but are planned for redevelopment into high density and modern mixed use areas.
- St Georges Island comprises mainly modern residential development, separated from the Castlefield Basin area by the Mancunian Way
- The Water Street area is currently characterised by lower density industry and warehousing, but will be redeveloped in coming years in line with the approved development framework.

5.7 The applicants suggest that the Castlefield Conservation Area is a robust starting point for the Neighbourhood Area. However, the Conservation Area does not cover a single coherent estate, but is varied in character, scale and

style. The Castlefield and St John's Conservation Areas were designated to recognise the significant heritage assets within the wider area, rather than a coherent character throughout.

- 5.8 Whilst the applicants comprise community groups whose memberships broadly cover the application area, the area covered by these groups comprises a number of distinct neighbourhoods as set out in paragraph 6.7. In these circumstances the geographic coverage of community groups should not be a determining factor in the assessment of the Neighbourhood Area application (criterion c above), particularly in light of an assessment against other considerations included in the PPG and the prevailing development policy context.
- 5.9 It is not considered that the proposed area does takes account of key infrastructure and physical features that would be logical Neighbourhood Area boundaries (criterion g above). In particular, the A56 and Mancunian Way are significant roads, which form a logical boundary to the south and west.
- 5.10 The area's population is likely to rise to around 12000 people, which is not in line with the criterion on population size. (see 5. 20 below).

Strategic Sites

- 5.11 The High Court¹ has considered how strategic sites (i.e. potential development areas of greater than local significance) should be considered by authorities in the determination of Neighbourhood Area applications. It was found that some sites can be too strategic in nature to be properly considered by a Neighbourhood Forum, which is by its nature more focused on existing residents and local concerns.
- 5.12 In the Daws Hill case, it was decided that sites the council removed from the area applied for were 'strategic sites that would have larger than local impacts upon larger "communities of interest" requiring any referendum to take place over a much wider area than the specified area, possibly extending to the whole of the District Council's area'. The Daws Hill case also raised the issue of false expectations, whereby the neighbourhood planning process would produce a plan covering strategic sites that already have development proposals in place, with the result that time and resources would be wasted.
- 5.13 The area applied for in Castlefield also includes several strategic sites, including the former ITV/Granada site, Cornbrook and Water Street. Development of a significant scale is also emerging around Ellesmere Street. The development of these sites will be strategic in nature and of importance particularly in terms of economic growth and the delivery of a key residential area which is critical to supporting the Council's objectives of meeting its targets for residential development. For these sites, effective planning needs to be based on a broad, strategic perspective, which is difficult to achieve through Neighbourhood Planning. Furthermore, many of these have established development frameworks or planning permissions in place which

¹ Daws Hill, Buckinghamshire, 2013

have been consulted upon and which would have potential to cause frustration if included in a Neighbourhood Planning process. It is, therefore, recommended that there is a clear basis for these sites to be excluded from the Castlefield Neighbourhood Area.

- 5.14 However, this does not mean that there will be no engagement with local communities within these areas (indeed there will already have been consultation on extant planning permissions and endorsed frameworks) when proposals come forward.

Manchester City Council's Neighbourhood Planning Policy Framework

- 5.15 The following requirements are Manchester-specific and are taken from the Council's Neighbourhood Planning Policy Framework as set out in the executive report *Manchester City Council Policy Framework for Neighbourhood Planning*.

- 5.16 **“Proposals for Neighbourhood Planning will be supported only where they complement wider Council policies and programmes for the regeneration of the City and its neighbourhoods.”**

- The application area sits within the Regional Centre as defined within the local plan, with the area to the east of the Mancunian Way being within the City Centre. The core strategy and national policy (including the Northern Powerhouse initiative) both implicitly and explicitly promote development in the Regional and City Centre.
- The Council has published frameworks and strategies that already give expression to future development plans in the area applied for which are necessary to support growth.. As inferred above, these have been the subject of wide ranging consultation with local residents and other stakeholders. The existing policies and frameworks that underpin and promote a high quantity of growth in the area applied for include:
 - The Northern Powerhouse initiative
 - The Greater Manchester Strategy
 - Manchester's Core Strategy
 - The City Centre Strategic Plan 2015-18
 - Manchester Residential Growth Strategy
 - Strategic Regeneration Frameworks (SRF):
 - Cornbrook
 - St Johns
 - Water St

The City and Regional Centres are the key drivers of our strategic growth objectives and are economically and socially critical to the City, the Region and indeed the Northern Powerhouse. Significant growth in both employment and residential sectors is proposed and the Council specifically promotes high density development on brownfield sites in this area. Neighbourhood Planning could undermine this approach.

- In accordance with these key and fundamental objectives for growth the Council as local planning authority has already granted some very significant planning permissions in the area. Although not affected by Neighbourhood Planning provided they are implemented in the normal

timescale this raises a question about possible expectations and wasted effort if the sites are included for Neighbourhood Planning purposes.

- 5.17 This is tied to the real possibility that a Neighbourhood Plan would conflict with existing Council policy as a significant proportion of the proposed area has a comprehensive and detailed suite of policies and guidance in place to promote the development of the area within the Council's growth commitments for the city and region as a whole. This is an area that is critically important if the city is to meet its development ambitions.
- 5.18 Therefore, it is proposed that the boundary applied for be reduced to exclude areas that will see major development in the coming years. However it should include more established and mature areas at the heart of Castlefield which contain local development opportunities where a Neighbourhood Plan could complement the Council's existing and successful approach to development. This would allow local residents to engage over matters in their immediate environs, without conflicting with the wider development of the City Centre
- 5.19 **“Proposals for Neighbourhood Planning will only be supported as a means of delivering the aims of the Manchester Strategy and those of the applying relevant body. The Council will promote the use of the most appropriate measures to achieve these aims”.**
- The Manchester strategy (*“Our Manchester”*) promotes development in Manchester city centre of which the area applied for is an important part. For example, *Our Manchester* states that *“the St John’s area of the city centre will become a major new centre for creative and cultural business anchored by the Factory, Manchester’s new arts and culture venue”* (p.30).
- 5.20 As plans are in place for the St John’s area which will have a regional impact any future Neighbourhood Plan has potential for conflict with local policy, therefore, it is proposed that St John’s area is not included in the designated area.
- 5.21 **“Proposals for Neighbourhood Planning will be supported in areas that can reasonably be represented by Neighbourhood Forums in terms of population and strategic significance”**
- An average electoral ward with a population of around 5500 is set out in the guidance (see above) as a useful starting point for judging the appropriateness of the size of an area. Currently around 6200 people live in the area applied for (estimate based on council tax data).
 - The area’s population is forecast to roughly double with up to 12000 residents in the foreseeable future.
 - The Council is concerned that the scale of the area proposed for designation is potentially too large for a forum to be capable of accurately representing and planning for. The Act sets out the requirements for designation of a Neighbourhood Forum and one of these is that a relevant body must have a minimum of 21 members to be designated as a Forum. Whilst this is a minimum figure, and a Forum could potentially have more members at the point of designation, there is nothing to prevent membership reducing to 21 once designated. It is not certain that this

number of residents could properly represent the views and interests of such a large area.

6 Recommendations

- 6.1 Officers have proposed a revised area as shown in Appendix 1 for the reasons set out in the paragraphs above. The amended boundaries proposed would broadly be Liverpool Road to the north, the edge of the Roman Gardens to the east, the A56 to the south, the Mancunian Way (inner ring road) to the west, and the River Medlock and the railway viaduct to the North West. It is considered that these are clearly defined boundaries, which are the most appropriate in the context of the assessment of area character.
- 6.2 The amendments are aimed at creating a Neighbourhood Area that better reflects guidance, by ensuring it has a clear and coherent character. The Roman fort area, which gives Castlefield its name, is taken as the starting point for locating the area, along with the nearby Castlefield basin which forms a distinctive and valuable coherent urban neighbourhood. It comprises the roman fort, arena, the canal basin, the historic castellated railway structures, and the oldest warehouses associated with the earlier stages of industrialisation. These areas together form the generally accepted heart of Castlefield. Strategic sites where plans are well-progressed have been excluded from the Neighbourhood Area.
- 6.3 Whilst taking into account the guidance above, the Council's decision over the scale of Neighbourhood Area to designate has also taken into account how it can be amended to support, rather than change, the Council's existing strategy for the area, and has also considered where a Neighbourhood Plan would be best placed to 'add value' to the planning framework already in existence.

7 Conclusions

- 7.1 It is the view of officers that an appropriate Neighbourhood Area for the purposes of Neighbourhood Planning should be revised and reduced for the reasons set out in this report. It is therefore recommended that Executive designate the alternative area proposed (as shown in blue in the plan at Appendix 1) as a Neighbourhood Area.

8 Next Steps

- 8.1 The designation of the Castlefield Neighbourhood Area will be publicised by the Council, as required by the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

9 Contributing to the Manchester Strategy

9.1 A thriving and sustainable city

The Neighbourhood Forum (when designated) will be able to produce a Neighbourhood Development Plan for the appropriate area in accordance with

the existing development plan. This should help to safeguard and develop the area as an attractive location for both residential and commercial uses.

9.2 A highly skilled city

Well-planned development can support delivery of training and employment opportunities.

9.3 A progressive and equitable city

Neighbourhood planning processes encourage residents to get involved and influence decision-making.

9.4 A liveable and low carbon city

Good neighbourhood planning would help support the development of the area along sustainable lines though balancing the interests of development and growth with the use and conservation of the historic environment.

9.5 A connected city

Well-planned development can improve connections within an area.

10 Key Polices and Considerations

10.1 Equal Opportunities

All communities across the City have the opportunity to get involved in neighbourhood planning.

10.2 Risk Management


No significant risks have been identified.

10.3 Legal Considerations

The Council has the powers to designate neighbourhood areas in line with the Act. This report sets out the matters to which the Council must have regard in making this decision. The Council is required to consider whether it should designate the Castlefield Neighbourhood Area as a business area.

APPENDIX 1 – Castlefield Neighbourhood Area

The plan below shows the area specified in the application and the area proposed for designation as a Neighbourhood Area



Appendix 2 – Consultation Responses

Comments in Favour of the Application

56 submissions were received stating:

“I support the boundary as currently put out for consultation.”

39 submissions were received stating:

“I have reviewed the proposed boundary and would like to place my support for the boundary as currently drawn.”

2 submissions were received stating:

As a resident of St John's Gardens I am writing to say that I feel strongly that this area should be included in the boundary for the “Castlefield neighbourhood” as proposed after extensive consultations with the Castlefield Forum.

St John's Gardens was one of the first areas of residential development in the 1970's to encourage people to live in the City. It is an historic area that is surrounded by listed buildings which form part of the heritage assets within the Castlefield basin.

Buildings, such as MOSI, which lie adjacent to St John's Gardens have a history which is intertwined with the Castlefield basin. Visitors to the city appreciate and enjoy this area which forms a refreshingly peaceful and distinct contrast to the commercial area of Spinningfields and that of the proposed framework for Granada.

In order to contribute to the strategy of the “Castlefield neighbourhood” it is important to have a feeling of “belonging” so that the cohesive story of the history of the area is maintained and strengthened by the very people who live in the area and can deliver the story worldwide.

I support the boundary as currently put out for consultation and NOT the MCC proposed option.

I think the proposed enlargement of Castlefield's boundaries is an excellent idea that will encourage regeneration in the surrounding areas.

I am writing to express my views that the housing development St John's Gardens be included in the boundary for the “Castlefield neighbourhood” as proposed after the consultations with the Castlefield Forum.

St John's Gardens were one of the first areas of residential development in the 1970's to encourage people to live in the city. It is a historic area that includes many listed buildings which form part of the heritage assets within the Castlefield basin. The adjacent MOSI and St John's Gardens itself also have a history entwined with the Castlefield basin. They should be united within the Castlefield neighbourhood to

provide a cohesive history of the area.

I am advised via the Castlefield Forum that the planning department and Council Executive propose a very small area for the Castlefield neighbourhood plan rather than the much more encompassing area proposed in the application.

This position seemingly taken by the Council ahead of consultation on the matter appears to massively limit the amount of scope and influence of the neighbourhood plan and bizarrely is a much smaller area than the designated Castlefield Conservation Area that is published by the Council and incorporates most of the neighbourhood plan area proposed for this neighbourhood plan application.

The Council proposed area is already fully developed with little or no spare land or development opportunities where the neighbourhood plan could if covering. A wider area have far more of a significant beneficial interest and reflect the Castlefield Conservation Area designation.

It is noted that much of the neighbourhood plan's proposed area for Castlefield has for many years been endorsed by the Council as being in Castlefield given the more up market and recognised appeal of the area rather than St Georges, Knot Mill, St Johns Gardens etc. But all of a sudden the Council seem to want to curb the association. To suit who exactly?

It is disappointing that the Council are once again trying to avoid or limit the involvement of local people. This appears to be both by Council Executive and the planners following the Executive's position. This is despite the Council supposedly tasked with acting in the interests of the people of Manchester. Unfortunately the Council focus seems entirely on developer interests without any checks or balances on the quality or impact of developments – even in conservation areas. An unfortunate consequence of the Leese / Bernstein dictatorship over the last 15 years are all too apparent across the City including in the Castlefield conservation area.

Investment has come to Manchester but at what price?

Already much development can be seen as shoddy, short sighted or a scar on the city – including much in Castlefield (despite it being a Conservation Area). Residents are not in general anti-development. But it is about a balance between developers and their financial interests and the City's long term future, pride and for residents their home environment. The Council should be listening to the people and working with them for a better City. Instead we are openly criticised, ignored or ridiculed by the Council themselves for daring to care about the City. Not least in the undermining of this application. Please reconsider the boundary. The Castlefield Conservation Area is surely a credible guide.

I'm writing this letter to express my concerns and disappointment to hear that your proposals are for a much more confined area for the neighbourhood, which is clearly designed to debilitate the intent of the original proposed neighbourhood plan.

The whole idea of the original proposed boundaries is to bring people together under the same banner and cooperate to drive action and resolve issues which are shared across all residents within those proposed boundaries. This is particularly important, considering the lack of improvement plans by the Council itself; for many years the larger Castlefield area has been neglected.

Moreover, the counter-proposal from the Council ignores years of evolution of the

boundaries of the area which has expanded and how the residents within the proposed, expanded, boundaries are already working together as one to make this neighbourhood a better place for residents. It is ironic that the Council's own strategic plan of 2015-18 is more in line with the residents' proposal yet you seem to be contradicting even your own plans.

I believe that if the Council's proposals go ahead this will create issues within the community and make it impossible to drive the necessary action to enable us to improve the neighbourhood.

As a Castlefield resident for almost 5 years, I support the boundary as currently put out for consultation. I currently reside at Saint George's Island and feel strongly that this is part of Castlefield.

I have lived in this area now for 16 years.
When I thought about buying my first home I took a huge risk in buying into the area on Hulme Hall Road.
Back then the area was either wasteland or derelict. I had to live with it this way before it was slowly developed. My parents thought me mad.
What made me take this risk buying my first home in such an ugly landscape?
After looking at the boundary of the Castlefield Urban Heritage Park I felt a little more at ease when I realised that my potential new home would be within that boundary. Urban Splash also sold it as being in Castlefield.
We are now developing a good sense of community and feel to reduce the area of Castlefield as intended and cut those living at the other side of the Mancunian Way off from Castlefield Basin is disgusting.
Many of us here volunteer to clean the local streets of dog excrement, we work planting flowers and tidying public spaces in Castlefield.
We constantly consider ways in which we can improve the local area. Often things it would seem that those at the council just don't seem to care about.

Now what a terrible reward we get for our services. What an awful thing to do to those living here, especially those working so hard to get on the property ladder and believing they have purchased a home in Castlefield.
It would see that those in power don't mind the developers selling their homes within Castlefield when in fact soon we may not. Should we contact these developers and ask for a refund or a reduction in price?

This decision to reduce Castlefield, is selfish, irresponsible and no doubt made by those who do not reside here and understand the community that has sprouted in recent years.

I fully support the new intended boundary and would rather see the boundary of the urban heritage park expanded, not reduced.

I would like to know exactly whose idea this was, maybe we can find where they live and suggest a new name for their home too.

I'm disgusted at this whole idea. Officer's Recommendation? I'd like to meet the person responsible and give them my own personal recommendation.

This is peoples homes, property, investments, futures, lives you are playing with.

To find MOSI wouldn't even be in Castlefield anymore is an utter joke.

As a resident of the area and a former employee of a local business, I believe that the boundary proposed reflects the local residents, businesses and committee members who make up this area of the city whilst acknowledging the physical and historical properties that define it.

I support the application for the development of a statutory neighbourhood plan for Castlefield.

As a resident in [redacted] since early 2012 and St George's Island, I personally feel like this current boundary is very exclusive and not representative of people who classify themselves as part of the neighbourhood. We pay the same high rent as Castlefield residents, support what local businesses are present and volunteer to clean up the area when possible.

I do hope the Council considers the opinions of the local residents within the (extended) boundary.

I would just like to add my voice and support to the neighbourhood planning application for Castlefield. As detailed below and in the application the new proposed boundaries cover the sites and residences of the Castlefield community whom have helped develop the area, support local business and will continue to do so. I have been a resident and leaseholder here for ten years now on Worsley Street in the Britannia Basin area and have always considered it Castlefield, making use of all the amenities available there. I can also see that on council maps this area is considered Castlefield so see no reason this neighbourhood shouldn't be designated as such?

As a resident of Britannia Mills for the past 7 years I have always considered that the mill sat within the Castlefield area (in fact that is how all of the property in the area is marketed) and benefitted from association with the heritage and quality of environment. During the same period I have seen how the Castlefield Forum has furthered the standing of the area and improved and enhance the whole area for the good of all. This applies not just the residents but also businesses and tourists who have seen an uplift in safety, cleanliness, interpretation and a general positivity that comes from enhanced shared public environments.

I believe the designation of a Neighbourhood Area in Castlefield (as defined by the plan submitted in the application) will continue to see the benefits retained and built upon and therefore must be approved.

I would hope that the Council will approve what is a very supportive and developmental proposal for the benefit of all Castlefield residents/.

As a resident of Castlefield I support the proposed Neighbourhood plan and most importantly the current proposed boundary.

As an owner occupier within Britannia Mills, Hulme Hall Road, I fully support and endorse the application for designation of a Neighbourhood Area in Castlefield, and in the first instance I also support the definition of the proposed Castlefield boundary.

I would however wish to see further detail regarding the articles of association and the relevant processes regarding the running of the Castlefield Forum, and how local residents can have a direct influence on the planning decision making process for the Castlefield area?

I fully support the proposed Neighbourhood plan and especially the proposed boundary. I feel very strongly that Ellesmere Street to St Johns Gardens should be included.

St Johns Gardens is historically and clearly acknowledged as part of the Castlefield Basin. Indeed previous Council reports have referenced this fact.

It hence needs to be acknowledged as part of the Castlefield neighbourhood strategy / development..

As a St Johns resident I expect to remain part of this geographical neighbourhood and a participant in future consultations on the area's developmental strategy / issues.

What a wonderful idea
Gets my full support
Its am amazing space I'm proud to live in


I firmly believe this is an excellent idea that allows local residents and businesses to be more involved in the development of their local community. This is an appropriate way to build further on the community building already done by Castlefield Forum in the area.

In addition, I believe that the area to be covered should be as broad as possible to include all people who feel as if they apart of the Castlefield area, rather than use some historic, narrower definition.

Not surprisingly, as [redacted] I strongly support the boundary submitted to the Council by the Forum. [redacted] spent a long time thinking and consulting about it. I think the much much smaller boundary suggested by Officers to Ward Councillors is ludicrously small.

The boundary proposed by the Forum is basically the Castlefield & St John's Conservation Areas put together plus two additions – the Knott Mill area and the southern 'pointy bit' from the Conservation Area boundary down to Castlefield Locks.

Both areas are defined as Castlefield in the Council's own City Centre Strategy agreed by the Executive only a few weeks ago:



The 'pointy bit' has been included in the Forum's boundary ever since we were formed 8 years ago. It has always been marketed as Castlefield. It includes the apartment building called Castlefield Locks.

If push came to shove, I personally wouldn't mind if the new St John's area were excluded. After all, a Masterplan and the built form for the area have already been agreed and three substantial planning applications already approved. I can see a logic for excluding it. I think the decision should depend on what Allied London wish. But the case for including all the rest of our proposed area is very strong and robust.

I do not agree with the reduced area proposed by the council for Castlefield for the following reasons;

- the residents of the area do not identify with just that smaller area but by the area put forward by the Castlefield forum
- the established Castlefield forum respects the wider catchment (as proposed in their plan) and to have a different definition by the council would be both confusing and divisive
- the council have recognised in earlier publications made by the planning team that the border of Castlefield is just as the forum propose
- the governance and strength of the Castlefield forum has collectively delivered positive improvement (and thus attracted investment, dwellers and tourists) and should not be weakened
- the areas bordering have little / no community body that could deliver the same

amount of effort and dedication to improve such a part of our city.

I live in the heart of Castlefield opposite Mamucium. I feel strongly the counter proposals by the council are too narrow and frankly an insult to the area.

I greatly admire the cohesion and community spirit brought about by the hard work and dedication of the Castlefield forum and would be appalled if actions taken by the council somehow compromised the effectiveness of that work by carving out a small pocket of the area contrary to what most residents feel is Castlefield.

I writing to object to Castlefield neighbourhood boundary proposed by Manchester City Council, and to support the alternative neighbourhood boundary proposed by the Castlefield Forum/Our Castlefield for the following reasons:

- Residents within the larger boundary identify as being part of Castlefield
- Castlefield Forum recognises the larger boundary, providing leadership and a focus for community action and supporting the council's efforts in sustainable regeneration.

For the council to redefine the neighbourhood boundary could effectively disenfranchise the areas outside the smaller area.

- Manchester City Council have previously referenced the larger boundary in previous publications. I do not believe the rationale for re-drawing Castlefield as a smaller area has been adequately justified.

Even though I live within the smaller boundary, I feel sufficiently strongly to object in writing. I believe Manchester City Council should be rightly proud of what has been achieved in partnership with Castlefield residents to-date, and consider very carefully any moves which could diminish the potential for future success.

I support the boundary as currently put out for consultation and for the reasons as set out in the boundary supporting statement.

I am a Castlefield resident and I support in full the boundary as proposed by the Castlefield Neighbourhood Forum. Surely it is the case that residents of an area know best how to define its boundaries.

I support the boundary as currently put out for consultation and I am disappointed to learn that, prior the consultation commencing, a Planning Officer wrote to all Ward Councillors supporting a much smaller area.

I currently live in Castlefield and have done so for the past 7 years. I love the unique feel that the area has with the canals, the bridges and the amenities.

A Neighbourhood plan would be a great way to make sure that Castlefield retains its special ambience by giving the people who care about the area a voice.

Having lived in Manchester for a good part of my life and the last years now in the heart of Castlefield – under all definitions. It is interesting to see the take on how people feel what Castlefield is and how they become proud to be a part of it.

- The proposed submitted site appears larger than required but actually is logical, as does mostly have well defined boundaries with locations people would define as living within Castlefield – the fields around the castle. Not including MOSI and the

Castlefield Gallery would be illogical and the new Chord would be a historical/modern edge; as well as the walking/running route along the canals for commuters and the Harriers. The canal part area under Chester road would also be essential for continuity.

- It should not be reduced, as then changing the strategy plan layout, except for very specific and explainable reasons regarding specific areas. The benefit of keeping the core area harmonious is of extreme benefit to the surrounding and the new surrounding residences as there are plenty of disastrous planning systems in the North West without a social core.

It is very pleasing to see community actions working and the Facebook site with for example the community garden cleaning activity being only something to encourage; this is a great opportunity to embrace and everyone to work together,

I'm an outsider to Manchester but have chosen to make Castlefield my home. I am overwhelmed by the community spirit here and, generally, the will to do the right thing. That's why I am part of the Castlefield Forum and active in this great community. The following is my own and is does intended to represent the Forum.

I strongly believe we have the right blend of people in the community to make the Neighbourhood Plan a success.

Rather than come across as NIMBYS, my experience of the Forum is actually to encourage good development in the area.

Case in point - Jackson's Wharf - now The Wharf - was about making sure a brilliant block of apartments was built and not about saving a faux 'warehouse-looking' pub that had lain derelict for years. The end result is not what any of us expected but showed what can happen when a community sets its sights high. We want Castlefield filled with brilliant buildings, built environment, heritage and green space.

I'm a progressive person, but I temper this with conserving all that's good about Manchester. I respect things need to change but that the community should be a really active part of driving that change.

Another case in point - Ordsall Chord. I support the Chord being built (albeit a tunnel would have been even better) but I don't support the alignment that forever destroys Grade 1 listed assets.

This is short term gain and could have been re-engineered. Sadly, the powers that be want quick results and corners cut. As the custodians of Manchester and our incredible heritage, we should have expected better. I want change, I want brilliant transport links, but it doesn't have to be at the cost of cutting corners.

So, I want a Neighbourhood Plan in place so that we can have a grown-up dialogue about our local area and how it should be developed. To reiterate, I am progressive and want to build on all plots that should be built upon, with a varied mix of styles, uses and finishes. I welcome crazy-tall skyscrapers. But I also welcome respect for the amazing place that Castlefield has become.

Please include my support for the full boundary as proposed and not the much smaller boundary as proposed by the Council.

St Johns Gardens is a historic area of the city that is surrounded by listed buildings that form part of the heritage assets of the wider Castlefield area. It was the first residential area in the city centre.

A number of the buildings next to St Johns gardens such as MOSI, have a history that is intertwined with the Castlefield basin.

To maintain a cohesive story of our history, St Johns Gardens should be designated neighbourhood of Castlefield and contribute to the strategy of the area.

As a local resident if feel very strongly about this

I believe that St John's, Rozel Square and MOSI are integral to the character of Castlefield, and the MCC officer's proposed area is insufficient.

As a resident of St John's Gardens since 1983 I very much hope that this development will remain within the boundaries of Castlefield. As you are aware SCG is of historical interest as it was the first residential development to be built in the city centre. I have always considered myself a resident of Castlefield and, as such, I hope we will be included so that we can continue to have input into issues that affect the area.

I am a Castlefield resident living in St Johns Gardens opposite the Museum of Science & Industry and wish to be part of the Castlefield neighbourhood area, whose boundary has been proposed after extensive consultations.

St Johns Gardens is a historic area of the city that is surrounded by listed buildings that form part of the heritage assets of the wider Castlefield area. I have lived in the city centre for nearly 30 years & everyone I know refers to this area as being Castlefield. In fact in recent years the City Council has funded information boards both in the gardens themselves & at the top of St John Street referring to the area as Castlefield. The area is rich in heritage and several buildings next to St Johns Gardens such as MOSI, have a history that is intertwined with the Castlefield basin. It is one of the longest established residential areas in the city and people strongly identify with the Castlefield area.

To maintain a cohesive sense of place St Johns Gardens and the surrounding area (such as MOSI, Upper Campfield Market, the gardens themselves and St John Street) needs to be part of the designated neighbourhood of Castlefield and contribute to the strategy of the area.

Live in St John's Gardens ("SJG").

SJG is a historic area of the city that is surrounded by listed buildings that form part of the heritage assets of the wider Castlefield area.

Further, certain of the buildings next to SJG, such as MOSI, have a history that is intertwined with the Castlefield basin.

To maintain a cohesive story of our history, SJG needs to be part of the designated neighbourhood of Castlefield and contribute to the strategy of the area.

Please note, prior to the framework for Granada and the naming ceremony undertaken by Allied London, SJG has always been referred to as part of the Castlefield area..

Finally, as a resident in SJG I wish to be part of the Castlefield neighbourhood area, whose boundary has been proposed after extensive consultations.

There is much debate about where the actual border of Castlefield lies. St. John's Gardens may be a short distance from the actual Canal Basin, traditionally the centre of Castlefield itself. However, the Gardens are surrounded by all manner of listed buildings. As a resident in St, John's Gardens since almost the outset, I must say, there has never been a doubt in my mind that we are part of Castlefield. In any case, it is vital that St. John's Gardens form part of the designated Neighbourhood of Castlefield allowing it to contribute to the strategy of the area.

I support the boundary as currently put out for consultation.

St John's Gardens is a historic area surrounded by many listed buildings that are intrinsically connected to the heritage assets of the wider Castlefield area.

MSI has a history that is embedded with the Castlefield basin and to keep a truly coherent story of the history of the area, it is essential that St John's Gardens is part of the designated neighbourhood of Castlefield and so able to contribute to the strategy of the area. Furthermore, St John's Gardens has always been referred to as part of the Castlefield area.

As a resident of St John's Gardens, and given the above considerations, I advise that I wish to be part of the Castlefield neighbourhood area, whose boundary has been proposed after extensive consultations.

As a resident in SJG I wish to be part of the Castlefield neighbourhood area, whose boundary has been proposed after extensive consultation.

SJG is a historic area of the city that is surrounded by listed buildings that form part of the heritage assets of the wider Castlefield area.

Further, certain of the buildings next to SJG, such as MOSI, have a history that is intertwined with the Castlefield basin.

To maintain a cohesive story of our history, SJG needs to be part of the designated neighbourhood of Castlefield and contribute to the strategy of the area.

Prior to the framework for Granada and the naming ceremony undertaken by Allied London, SJG has always been referred to as part o the Castlefield area.

I do not support the redrawing of the Castlefield Neighbourhood Plan Boundaries. The extent of Castlefield has been set out for many years and at the top of St John Street, there has been a map of the Castlefield area present for over 20 years.

The majority of the historic buildings fall outside the proposed new boundaries: MOSI, Upper and Lower Campfield Markets, the first Railway Station in the world, St John's Gardens themselves, the Georgian Houses on St. John Street, the Knott Mill and southern section and most of the canal side falls outside the proposed new area.

Many of the residents in wider St Johns Conservation Area and the Castlefield Neighbourhood chose to buy their properties in these areas because they are within the existing Conservation Areas. I would object STRONGLY to any re-designation of HRA grounds alone.

I live in St John's Gardens opposite the Park and I bought my property in 1994. I have bought it because it was within a Conservation Area and part of the historic Castlefield Neighbourhood. The only reason for the redesignation I can see is to make it easier for developers to come in and remove more of the cities heritage. Other cities in the UK are desperately clinging to their heritage: why do Manchester Planners attach so little importance to our industrial heritage? We should be proud of it, nurture it and protect it! There are plenty of other areas in Manchester that have the potential for redevelopment like the Allied London Plan (which I support) and the Noma Plan (which I like). The city has a diverse population, and a rich and diverse history from the Roman remains, through the middle ages and the Black Death pits, the Industrial Revolution, the Luddite movement, workers rights, the birthplace of communism with Engels and Marx writing the Condition of the Working Classes, all of which are all intimately bound up in or can be traced directly to the Castlefield Area. The first link to Liverpool was at the bottom of Quay Street, the worlds first railway station on Liverpool Street, etc.

The area has a rich history uniquely connected to and in many cases being, a world first. We as a city should be proud of that and we should preserve and protect it.

The tourist potential of the area has not been fully developed and I believe the area should be promoted as a site of world importance linking modern Manchester with its history and influence across the world, not reduced, and rendered meaningless by disconnecting the area for redevelopment. The canal network, the extension of the canal up Camp Street to by-pass the taxation in the Castlefield basin, all of this is still here whereas most other historic areas of the city have already been lost, to the Blitz, to 1950's ill conceived development, and the Arndale destruction of the historic heart. We should be proud of our heritage and protect it, not remove yet more protections.

I oppose the re-designation.

I support the boundary as currently put out for consultation.

In particular I feel that St John's Garden is a historic area of the city that is surrounded by listed buildings that form part of the heritage assets of the wider Castlefield area.

Further, certain of the buildings next to St John's Garden such as MOSI, have a

history that is intertwined with the Castlefield basin.

To maintain a cohesive story of our history, St John's Garden needs to be part of the designated neighbourhood of Castlefield and contribute to the strategy of the area.

Note, prior to the framework for Granada and the naming ceremony undertaken by Allied London, St John's Garden has always been referred to as part of the Castlefield area..

Finally, as a resident in St John's Garden I wish to be part of the Castlefield neighbourhood area, whose boundary has been proposed after extensive consultations"

I am a resident of St. John's Gardens, my address is [redacted].

My home is in the St John Street conservation area, an historic part of Manchester with many listed buildings which form part of the heritage assets of the wider Castlefield area. Further, certain of the buildings adjacent or near to SJG, such as MOSI, Campfield Market, Liverpool Road Station, have a history that is intertwined with the Castlefield basin. Therefore, to maintain a cohesive story of our history, SJG needs to be part of the designated neighbourhood of Castlefield and contribute to the strategy of the area.

Note, prior to the framework for Granada and the naming ceremony undertaken by Allied London, SJG has always been referred to as part of the Castlefield area..

Regards the consultation on the Castlefield Neighbourhood Plan boundary, I am writing in support of the boundary as proposed by Castlefield Forum, and as a resident in SJG I wish to be part of the Castlefield neighbourhood area, whose boundary has been proposed after extensive consultations with businesses and residents local to the area.

I support the boundary as currently put out for consultation. I submit it would be wholly wrong to exclude the St John's Gardens complex from the boundaries of Castlefield for these purposes. Traditionally we have been known as part of Castlefield. The nature of our complex is in keeping with the historic aspects of the Castlefield area which contains heritage buildings such as the Campfield Market Halls, the old railway station and the Georgian buildings on Byrom Street. Indeed a branch of the Manchester and Salford Junction canal is under Culvercliff Walk. Manchester City Council in the past regarded it as part of Castlefield and still do so on their website. It is an integral part of the Castlefield Conservation Area. The Castlefield market occupied Liverpool Road and Byrom Street and "surrounding roads": see *Waterways into Castlefield* by John C Fletcher published in 1989. As a resident of Castlefield in St John's Gardens, I wish to contribute to the strategy of the area. If the Neighbourhood Plan is to achieve the government's aim in legislating, the area should not be restricted artificially to the tiny area proposed by the planning department., The purpose of restricting the area to such a small fraction of the area usually referred to as Castlefield appears to me to be a ploy to circumvent the purposes of the legislation.

Just want to give you my comments on the proposed neighbourhood planning area

for Castlefield. I believe St John's Gardens should be included as part of the Castlefield neighbourhood planning area. The St John's development is one of the most unique residential areas in Manchester City centre and is part of the cultural and historical makeup of Castlefield. For years I have received mail explicitly address to my home in Castlefield. Anybody who is familiar with the area would not doubt that St John's is part of Castlefield. To make it not so in official council recordings would be counter intuitive for many.

I support the boundary as currently put out for consultation by the Castlefield Forum as it corresponds with most people's idea of the area and because, as a resident of St John's Gardens, I would like my home to be included. I also think that the historic and listed buildings around St John's gardens and down Liverpool Road should enjoy the extra protection that inclusion in a Neighbourhood area would bring.

The much smaller area proposed by the council seems pretty blatantly intended to restrict the potential resistance to the expansion of Spinningfields across Quay Street and the controversial large scale development of the Granada site as well as being dramatically different to the boundary published in their own Strategic Plan,

I support the boundary as currently put out for consultation, which includes St John's Garden's residential area.

I support the boundary as currently put out for consultation, that is the area which includes St John's Gardens estate, MOSI and St George's.

I support the boundary as currently put out for consultation - at Dinton St to the south west and Quay St to the north.

I support the proposed boundary as set out by the Castlefield Neighbourhood plan currently put out for consultation. I do not support the area that the MCC officer has recommended.

St Johns Gardens (including the old St Johns Churchyard) is an oasis in the Southwest City Centre known as Castlefields and we believe must remain part of that designated area in any Neighbourhood Plan. We have yet to meet any local resident who does not believe that St. Johns Gardens are part of the Castlefields area wherein we align ourselves rather than the modern complexes of Spinningfields, Granadaland or the Great Northern complex.

Manchester City Council used to be a beacon for preservation of heritage and we would hope that this policy will continue. By confirming that St Johns Gardens and adjacent buildings, such as the listed Museum of Science and Industry, are in Castlefields the Council will accede to the wishes of residents and follow the guidance of the Localism Act 2011 in the production of a Neighbourhood Development Plan and ensure sensitive future development in line with local wishes.

I have read the submission of [redacted] and as a fellow SJG resident agree with the contents in full; SJG should be included in the Castlefield Neighbourhood plan.

If Castlefield indeed represents the roman heart of the city then SJG comprises the left atrium.

One only has to recite the street names that form the boundary of SJG to be convinced of its heritage pedigree.

Any submission to the contrary is risible.

I am writing to submit my response to the consultation on the Castlefield Neighbourhood Plan boundary. I support the boundary as currently put out for consultation. It is essential that if a definition of Castlefield is to be of any social relevance it must include a meaningful human element. Even on a restricted view of conservation, a monument's hinterland must be included. Otherwise the surrounding up-for-grabs area inevitably encroaches on the amenity value of the monument itself, until it loses all its stature and historical significance.

I wish to make a submission in the consultation regarding the proposed neighbourhood in Castlefield. As a long time resident of St John's Gardens I strongly support the inclusion of St John's Gardens in this area.

The community in SJG is very closely knit and has always aligned itself with Castlefield and the Castlefield forum. As a residential area in the City centre it is vitally important to preserve the identity and give a voice to the residents if (as MCC claim) it wants people to have a long term home in the City. I not only work in the City but have a small child and would like to continue to live in the City with my family. Areas like Castlefield and SJG make this possible but only if we have a voice in how our area, and our home, is shaped in the future.

MCC's recognition of our view as local residents is very important and I am sure that you will support our wishes in that.

I am writing to submit my response to the consultation on the Castlefield Neighbourhood Plan boundary.

St Johns Gardens (SJG) is a historic area of the city that is surrounded by listed buildings that form part of the heritage assets of the wider Castlefield area. Further, certain of the buildings next to SJG, such as MOSI, have a history that is intertwined with the Castlefield basin.

To maintain a cohesive story of our history, SJG needs to be part of the designated neighbourhood of Castlefield and contribute to the strategy of the area.

(Note, prior to the framework for Granada and the naming ceremony undertaken by Allied London, SJG has always been referred to as part of the Castlefield area.).

As a resident in SJG I wish to be part of the Castlefield neighbourhood area, whose boundary has been proposed after extensive consultations with local residents.

I support the boundary as currently put out for consultation. (Castlefield Forum application)

Re the application from the Castlefield Forum for a Castlefield Neighbourhood area, I

e-mail to fully support this application as submitted by the Castlefield Forum.

I feel that the whole area as proposed must be included and in fact I understand that it is included as such in both the Council's strategic plan and the Castlefield Conservation Area, and it must include the St John's Gardens area, which is currently included in the two Council documents noted above.

St John's Gardens is a historic area of the city that is surrounded by listed buildings that form part of the heritage assets of the wider Castlefield area.

Further, certain of the buildings next to Saint John's Gardens, such as Museum Of Science and Industry, have a history that is intertwined with the Castlefield basin.

To maintain a cohesive story of our history, Saint John's Garden's needs to be part of the designated neighbourhood of Castlefield and contribute to the strategy of the area.

Note, prior to the framework for Granada and the naming ceremony undertaken by Allied London, Saint John's Gardens has always been referred to as part of the Castlefield area in the Council's policy documents

Finally, as a resident in Saint John's Gardens I wish to be part of the Castlefield neighbourhood area, whose boundary has been proposed after extensive consultations

I am writing to state that I fully support the boundaries of Castlefield as proposed in the recently circulated maps. Whilst these appear to be extended beyond what a tourist might consider Castlefield, it is clear that the St Johns Gardens area fits coherently within the Castlefield area as they are part of one established residential area who's residents access the same local services, use the same transport links etc.

I would challenge the proposed area drawn up by council officers, firstly as I suspect none of these officers live in the area so would not be intimately aware of the geography of the area, secondly because the proposed area is far too small to have any value so renders the whole system pointless, and finally because this is a process to be led by the community not the council. Council officers and the leader have no place or right to discuss this and reach agreements behind closed doors.

As suggested in the document leaked by Manchester confidential, local elected councillors will have a view, but so will the people who elected them.

I am writing with regards to the application for the designation of a Neighbourhood Area in Castlefield, I would like to support the inclusion of the St. John's Gardens estate and St John's Gardens park within the proposed Neighbourhood Area boundary.

As a resident of St. John's Gardens I feel a part of the Castlefield community. St. John's Gardens is within the Castlefield Conservation Area and it is therefore logical and sensible also to include St. John's Gardens within the Castlefield Neighbourhood

Area.

I am concerned that recent development plans proposed by Manchester City Council ignore the wishes of residents in the area and will lead to a degradation of quality of life in the area surrounding St. John's Gardens. It is important that the residents of this historic area of the city are able to have a larger voice in how development proceeds within the area in order to maintain its unique characteristics.

I write as a resident within the boundary to support the Neighbourhood Plan as proposed by Castlefield Forum and Matthew Dixon.

I support the proposals outlined for the boundary of the Castlefield Neighbourhood area. These boundaries use sensible and recognisable geographical features to delineate an area which residents identify as Castlefield, and they also accord with previously prepared Council plans.

I am a Castlefield resident and I support in full the boundary as proposed by the Castlefield Neighbourhood Forum. Surely it is the case that residents of an area know best how to define its boundaries.

As a 'Castlefield' resident of many years I have lived in different apartment blocks including Saint George's island, Moho and currently potato wharf. I consider all of the above areas as Castlefield and must say I was and am still very proud to live here, in such a beautiful area and community. The boundaries set by you are actually quite offensive to us as residents, we take massive pride in our area we live in and welcome development and change to better it for the future. Therefore I don't think it's much to ask to have more input into the choices made regarding the area and to feel some belonging to the community no matter what side of the road you live on. Therefore I believe our proposed boundaries as residents are spot on and would help to bring us all together more as a community instead of leaving those in certain buildings still paying high 'Castlefield' prices feeling out of the loop and not included in the area, especially when everyone in the area thinks of them as Castlefield residents anyway.

Please accept these email as comments on the recent neighbourhood plan for Castlefield. I think the boundary looks really positive for the new area and will be a boost for previous non-Castlefield areas.

I really hope this gets passed with a positive motion and believe that it will ensure the longstanding success and re-generation of Castlefield.

I am writing to support the application for the designation of a Neighbourhood Plan Area in Castlefield.

I have been fortunate enough to both live and work in Castlefield at regular intervals over the past decade. I have also introduced the area to many national and international visitors to the city. The area is of great value to local people as well as being an internationally significant visitor attraction.

The emergence of a Neighbourhood Plan for the area is an exciting development. I

hope that Manchester City Council will support the development of the Neighbourhood Plan and embrace the next phase of urban regeneration in partnership with the local community of residents and businesses.

I was concerned to see reports of MCC Officers' recommendations for a much reduced Neighbourhood Plan area. Such a reduced area, with almost no scope for new development, would constrain the Plan to such a degree that it would hardly be worth producing.

Castlefield Forum is now an established group with a track record of delivering improvements across Castlefield. It has already made great efforts to engage the local community in the emerging plan and it will continue to do so. The Forum recognises that Castlefield will continue to change into the future. The Neighbourhood Plan is an opportunity to help guide that change to benefit the local community and Manchester as a whole.

Just a quick note to say that I'd like to support the residents of Castlefield in asking for more control over planning and strategy in this area

I support the boundary as currently put out for consultation. The character of this area as a whole (from around MOSI all the way to Simon St.) creates a cohesive and quiet residential neighbourhood and should not be broken down smaller. The implications of reducing the boundary will have great impact on the surrounding sites breaking this character apart. I believe the nature of Castlefield to be a tranquil place within the city centre and I love the feel when I am walking home after a long day at work or on a sunny summer day. I fear if the boundary changes this tranquillity which I crave will no longer be achievable. As a landscape architect I believe Castlefield is integral to the workings of a city with little or no green space.

St John's Gardens is a historic area of the city that is surrounded by listed buildings that form part of the heritage assets of the wider Castlefield area.

Further, certain buildings next to St John's Gardens such as MOSI, have a history that is linked to the Castlefield basin. To maintain a cohesive story of our history, St John's Gardens needs to be part of the designated neighbourhood of Castlefield and contribute to the strategy of the area.

Prior to the framework for Granada, and the naming ceremony by Allied London, St John's Gardens has always been referred to as part of the Castlefield area.

Finally, as a resident of the Gardens, I wish to be part of the Castlefield neighbourhood, whose boundary has been proposed after extensive consultations

Comments against the Application

Submitted on behalf of a landowner:

Section 61F(5) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 sets out the conditions for designation that the relevant body should be able to demonstrate. Section 61G(3) confirms that in the case of an application by a relevant body, the neighbourhood area boundary must be one of, or includes the whole or any part of, the area of a parish council. In determining the application, the local planning authority must have regard to the desirability of designating the whole of the area as a neighbourhood area and the desirability of maintaining the existing boundaries of areas already designated as neighbourhood areas.

It is noted that although the relevant body is named the "Castlefield Forum", a neighbourhood forum has not yet been designated and the supporting information to the area application confirms that the forum application will be made following the outcomes on the area designation.

[Name redacted] consider the application to designate a neighbourhood area for Castlefield to be unnecessary. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises¹ that a neighbourhood plan should support the strategic development needs set out in the Local Plan and plan positively to support local development, as outlined in paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Furthermore, a neighbourhood plan needs to be deliverable, if the policies and proposals are to be implemented as the community intended.

The strategic planning policy basis for the Castlefield area, developed by Manchester City Council through extensive consultation with the local community and key stakeholders, already provides a detailed policy basis for the area. Consequently, the introduction of policies through the development of a neighbourhood plan would have to have regard to the Council's existing strategic development priorities. As such, whilst the Boundary Supporting Statement, submitted by the Castlefield Forum alongside the application to designate the neighbourhood area, advises that the neighbourhood area boundary has sought to ensure that no areas either currently developed or with the potential to be developed for future residential or business use are left isolated, the strategic policy basis against which the development on any potential development site within the area would be considered is the Development Plan for Manchester City Council.

The Development Plan for the area comprises the 'saved' policies of the Manchester Plan (the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (adopted July 1995)) and the Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted July 2012). The Unitary Development Plan refers to the possibility of housing being developed in the area, particularly in the [location redacted] area, including [address redacted]. As such, the 'saved' policies of the UDP offer support for major regeneration of the area including substantial new development comprising a mix of uses and environmental improvements.

Castlefield is also designated as a Conservation Area, designated in October 1979. The Council recognise the role of Castlefield identifying that in recent years

Castlefield has undergone dramatic changes which have transformed it from a forgotten corner of the city to a thriving centre of activity. Many projects are currently underway, and some of these will serve to trigger further activity in both the private and public sectors. Furthermore, as Castlefield has always been a centre of innovation, imaginative new proposals for development are likely to receive a warm welcome. The designation of Castlefield as a Conservation Area, and the associated policies within the Development Plan, ensures a policy basis for the historic environment of Castlefield.

In addition to the Development Plan, Manchester City Council has adopted a number of guidance documents which also provide strategic advice on the City's vision for an area. The Strategic Plan for the City Centre is highly relevant to the Castlefield Area, furthermore the adopted Core Strategy refers to it and provides an endorsement to its policies and approach. The Strategic Plan confirms that future residential development and conversion will remain appropriate in certain areas of the City Centre, including Castlefield. The section of the Strategic Plan which deals with the Castlefield area identifies that the area has a large residential population and sets out various objectives to improve the existing public realm and its identity. Furthermore, the Strategic Plan identifies Castlefield as an ideal opportunity area for additional residential development.

It is therefore clear that Manchester City Council have promoted a specific vision for Castlefield within the Development Plan and associated planning guidance documents, which are material considerations in the determination of any application. The vision for the continued improvement of the residential offer within Castlefield has been consistent over the past 20 years and therefore any approach within a neighbourhood plan which seeks to challenge this would severely undermine the long term strategic vision for Castlefield, which the Council has been successful in achieving thus far. [Name redacted], therefore, question what policy basis the creation of a Neighbourhood Plan for the area would add, when the City Council has developed an extensive strategic policy basis to guide the development of Castlefield over the past two decades?

In summary, [Name redacted] question the necessity of the designation of a neighbourhood area

Comments Recommending a Revised Boundary

I am writing to submit my response to the consultation on the Castlefield Neighbourhood Plan boundary. I strongly object to the boundary as currently put out for consultation. I live on Rice Street and believe that Castlefield should remain within its original boundaries.

I have lived in Manchester for seven and a half years, in Castlefield for three and a half of these, and am currently a resident of Potato Wharf.

Firstly, I am strongly in support of forming a Neighbourhood Area in Castlefield and creating a Neighbourhood Plan. It is evident through the community groups, local events and venue naming that Castlefield already has a distinct identity. A Neighbourhood Plan would help to enhance this further by describing what type of development complements this identity and the attraction that identity has for visitors and residents alike.

Personally, I think the proposed area outline is nearly correct, but I would say that the northernmost part (north of St John's gardens, taking a line from Camp Street) does not feel like part of the area to me. However, all the other parts of Castlefield (St George's Island, Water Street, Knott Mill etc) in the proposal should definitely be included.

Following a review of the application and the supporting documents submitted, I would like to make the following comments:

- No land should be included within the Castlefield Neighbourhood Plan boundary where there is already an adopted Strategic Regeneration Framework in place for the site, which is in accordance with the adopted Manchester Core Strategy and clearly defines a set of regeneration principles for the site. This is on the basis that detailed neighbourhood planning and local / public consultation, in the form of an adopted master plan and regeneration framework has already been recently undertaken in each of these cases.
- Any neighbourhood plan should incorporate and work with committed development (i.e. extant Planning Permissions) and also consents previously granted within this area that establish clear benchmarks in terms of development parameters.
- Any neighbourhood plan should respond to any committed development in close proximity that falls outside the boundary.
- The preparation of a neighbourhood plan should not cause any delay to proposals coming forward in Castlefield or other surrounding areas, where those proposals clearly accord with Manchester City Council's adopted planning policy (including Strategic Regeneration Frameworks) and other strategic objectives.
- In the interests of maintaining positive on-going engagement with the Castlefield Forum, [Name Redacted], as an important stakeholder in the Castlefield Area confirm their commitment to engage with Castlefield Forum as their proposals for the [address redacted] site come forward.

I am writing on behalf of [name redacted] in response to the consultation on the proposed Castlefield Neighbourhood Area.

a) Background

These representations relate to [name redacted] interest in land which forms part of the wider Water Street Strategic Regeneration Area. The currently proposed boundary of the Castlefield Neighbourhood Area includes this Strategic Regeneration Area.

The Water Street Strategic Regeneration area is bounded by the River Irwell, the Manchester to Liverpool Railway Viaduct, Regent Road/Dawson Street and the Cheshire Lines Railway Viaduct. It is approximately 10 hectares in extent, and is situated to the South West of the city centre. Please refer to appendix 1 which provides a location plan for the Water Street Strategic Regeneration area. This area is currently in use as an industrial estate, with a mixture of commercial, industrial and warehousing buildings, in various levels of use.

This is an area which has been identified by Manchester City Council for comprehensive redevelopment and is already undergoing significant change. The area is a major redevelopment opportunity and is identified in the adopted Water Street Strategic Regeneration Framework (WSSRF) (2011).

The WSSRF (2011) identifies land within its boundary as appropriate for a mix of commercial and residential uses, including [redacted], in the WSSRF. The WSSRF was adopted in 2011 following collaboration between Manchester City Council and the relevant land owners, including [name redacted]. The WSSRF is currently being refreshed and the updated version is likely to be adopted later this year.

b) Neighbourhood Planning Legislative Requirements and Guidance

A local planning authority must designate a neighbourhood area if it receives a valid application and some or all of the area has not yet been designated as a neighbourhood area (Section 61G (5) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Act). A Local planning authority can however refuse to designate the area applied for if it considers the area is not appropriate.

c) Representations

Whilst [redacted] actively support the local community engaging and influencing development, we are concerned that the proposed boundaries of the Neighbourhood Plan covers too great an area, and in particular, that it should not cover the WSSRF area (see appendix 1). This area already has an adopted framework in place, and a refresh of the document is currently being produced, both of which are or shortly will be in accordance with the adopted Manchester Core Strategy (2012). The adopted WSSRF already provides a set of clear principles which will guide development in the area and allow it to proceed in a co-ordinated manner. The current Framework has been, and the emerging draft will be, subject to consultation, and therefore the local community will have the opportunity to comment on and influence the proposals within it. It is important that the Neighbourhood Area does not conflict with the holistically planned approach provided in the WSSRF.

It is essential that any neighbourhood planning process is consistent with the objectives of the adopted Core Strategy (2012), the saved UDP Policies and the WSSRF. In particular, it is vital that any Neighbourhood Plan provides appropriate policy relevant to the local context of the 'neighbourhood' it relates to and does not replicate the role of strategic and area-specific policy in the above listed documents.

In the interests of the investment of time, energy and cost into work on a neighbourhood plan, work needs to be well targeted. It is considered that the Strategic Regeneration Area shown in Appendix 1 is already appropriately planned for through the WSSRF, which already sets out locally-specific guidance on the way in which development will come forward, and therefore it is not necessary to include it within the proposed Neighbourhood Area boundary.

To designate a Neighbourhood Area to include the full area in the application by Castlefield Forum could unrealistically raise expectations as to the effectiveness of a Neighbourhood Plan in relation to the strategic development sites within the Water Street Regeneration Area, which are already governed by the locally-specific guidance in the WSSRF.

Under Section 61G (6) of the Localism Act 2011, the Local Planning Authority can also consider modifying the boundary of the Neighbourhood Plan. We suggest that the Manchester City Council consider the potential to exclude the WSSRF area from the proposed Neighbourhood Plan Area.

It should be noted that, should the currently proposed boundary be accepted by the Council, a Neighbourhood Plan should reflect committed development that falls within areas with adopted frameworks and it should not be used to delay other proposals coming forward in any area, especially where those proposals clearly accord with Manchester City Council's adopted planning policy and other strategic objectives. Page 3

[Name redacted] look forward to continuing discussions with Castlefield Forum as the Neighbourhood Plan progresses in order to identify opportunities for integration and connectivity between the two plan areas.

I write on behalf of [name redacted] who have significant land interests both in and around the wider Castlefield area. [Name redacted] owns and operates [name redacted], has successfully delivered development within the Castlefield area and has aspirations to deliver strategically important residential development at [redacted].

As significant stakeholders within Castlefield and its surrounding area, [name redacted] welcomes the opportunity to comment on and contribute towards the designation of the Neighbourhood Area in Castlefield.

[Name redacted] recognises the importance of Neighbourhood Planning and are supportive of the concept of a Neighbourhood Plan for the Castlefield area, however we are concerned that the area proposed by the Castlefield Forum is too expansive, including areas which are historically and culturally different from Castlefield, and which could conflict with saved policies contained within the Extant Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

[Name redacted] support the proposed area recommended by Manchester City Council as it is a, more concise, neighbourhood boundary which is attached.

Policy Context

Paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that Neighbourhoods should;

'Plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan'

[Name redacted] considers that the starting point for the designation of any Neighbourhood Plan boundary should be the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (UDP) for that specific Borough.

St Johns / Left Bank, St Georges and Water Street are all areas included within the boundary proposed by the Castlefield Forum. Extant UDP Policy RC20: City Centre Small Area Proposals identifies Quay Street/Deansgate/ Liverpool Road/ River Irwell (Area 26), Rivers Medlock and Irwell/ Liverpool Road/ Chester Road/ Egerton Street (Area 27) and St Georges (Area 28) separately, highlighting their difference in character, identity and development needs.

The Draft City Centre Strategic Plan (2016-18) clarifies the differing identity and needs of each area further;

The St Johns area is earmarked for significant regeneration. The area is distinctly separate from Castlefield in character, culture and heritage with deep historical roots in both the industrial and media sectors. St Johns in itself is considered a City Centre neighbourhood with opportunity for its own community according to the draft City Centre Strategic Plan.

The Water Street area is also considered separate to Castlefield. The Strategic Plan states that this is a distinct City Centre neighbourhood with its own sense of place. Despite being within the Castlefield Conservation Area, Water Street is characterised by vacant / under used sites and poor public realm.

[Name redacted] acknowledges that there are a vast number of publically available plans which depict differing boundaries for the Castlefield area. An aspiration to be part of Castlefield should not be the rationale for inclusion within the Neighbourhood Plan boundary. The Extant UDP Policy RC20 and the Draft City Centre Strategic Plan make clear and concise differences between Castlefield and the surrounding areas of St Georges, St Johns and Water Street. As stated previously the Adopted UDP should be the starting point when defining an area for inclusion within a Neighbourhood Plan. The boundary proposed by Castlefield Forum goes beyond these established boundaries.

The boundary proposed by Castlefield Forum conflicts with the established boundaries within the extant and proposed planning policy documents. [Name redacted] therefore cannot support the boundary as drafted and has suggested an amended, revised boundary.

Historical Context

Historic mapping from the early 1800s shows Castlefield to be significantly smaller than what it is considered to be today. Based on the area of the Roman Fort, Castlefield is denoted as a pocket of land between the Bridgewater Canal and Coal

Wharf to the south and Bridgewater Street to the north, Potato Wharf to the west and Knott Mill to the east.

Similarly mapping from the 1950s continues to show Castlefield as the area located within this pocket of land, predominately focused around the location of the Roman Fort.

The Roman Fort was, and still is, considered to be the heart of Castlefield and the Neighbourhood Plan should focus the boundary broadly around this area.

Suggested Boundary for the Neighbourhood Plan Area

When considering the historical context and characteristics of Castlefield, as well as the established and justified distinction between Castlefield and its neighbouring areas, as denoted within the extant Policies of the existing UDP and the Draft City Centre Strategic Plan, [name redacted] has prepared the attached suggested boundary for the Castlefield Neighbourhood Area.

The suggested boundary acknowledges and does not undermine the distinct characteristics and strategic policy of the surrounding areas of St Johns, St Georges, and Water Street. Excluding these areas will create a boundary that truly represents Castlefield. The suggested neighbourhood area, as shown on the attached plan, is bound by Egerton St to the west, Potato Wharf to the north west, Liverpool Road to the north east, and Chester Road/ Bridgewater Viaduct to the south east, whilst also including Deansgate Quay to the south east. The inclusion of Deansgate Quay extends the boundary to the River Medlock, specifically including the Medlock Tunnel entrance. This Bridgewater Canal related infrastructure is considered significant to the Castlefield area as its construction during the industrial era enabled the diversion of the River Medlock beneath the Bridgewater Canal and facilitated the development of the Castlefield area as we know it today.

[Name redacted] considers that this boundary would be a more accurate representation of the Castlefield area both in terms of character and appearance, as well as excluding the areas of St Georges, St Johns and Water St, all of which represent their own characteristics and are covered in the extant UDP policies. This suggested boundary stays true to the historical Castlefield area which emanated from and is focused around the Roman Fort.

Conclusions

[Name redacted] recognises the importance of neighbourhood planning and supports the direction of the Castlefield Forum to designate an area and begin work on establishing a Neighbourhood Plan for Castlefield.

We are concerned with the scale of the proposed boundary and its conflict with existing and proposed planning policy. The adopted UDP should be the basis of any Neighbourhood Plan and we consider the proposed boundary by Castlefield Forum exceeds these established and distinct areas.

Historically, the area suggested by Castlefield Forum does not conform with any singular boundary, it is based on aspiration and a want of people to identify with, and be part of Castlefield. We acknowledge that our suggested boundary includes a small

section of land beyond Deansgate, specifically the River Medlock and the River Medlock Tunnel entrance at Deansgate Quay, which is marginally outside of the Castlefield area according to the extant UDP policies, however, [name redacted] considers the significance of this historical infrastructure and its importance in the industrial development of Castlefield is enough to warrant its inclusion within the Neighbourhood Boundary.

Other Comments

Historic England

We have no further comment regarding the proposed boundary, but are content with the consultation process and results of this to include the indicated areas beyond the Castlefield Conservation Area.

Given the extent of heritage assets in the area, when it comes to the next stage of your plan development it will be important to look at how these can be included in the management of the Neighbourhood.

You might consider contacting the staff at Manchester City Council's Conservation Team and also the Greater Manchester Archaeology service (based at Salford University) who look after the Historic Environment Record and give advice on archaeological matters. They should be able to provide details of not only any designated heritage assets but also locally-important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may also be available on-line via the Heritage Gateway (www.heritagegateway.org.uk). It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as the local Civic Society, local history groups, building preservation trusts, etc. in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan.

National Planning Practice Guidance is clear that where it is relevant, Neighbourhood Plans need to include enough information about local heritage to guide planning decisions and to put broader strategic heritage policies from the local authority led local plan into action at a neighbourhood scale. If appropriate this should include enough information about local non-designated heritage assets, including sites of archaeological interest, to guide decisions.

We have produced further information and guidance on how heritage can best be incorporated into Neighbourhood Plans. This signposts a number of other documents which your community might find useful in helping to identify what it is about your area which makes it distinctive and how you might go about ensuring that the character of the area is retained. These can be found at:-

<http://www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/>

United Utilities

United Utilities does not wish to submit any formal comments at this stage, however wish to be kept informed and consulted with further should this designation be approved.

It is important that United Utilities are kept aware of any future development plans and supporting policies to ensure we can facilitate the delivery of the necessary sustainable infrastructure at an appropriate time. Therefore we encourage further consultation with us once a draft Neighbourhood Plan is commenced as we may submit detailed comments at the Draft Plan public consultation stage.

Environment Agency

We look forward to being consulted on the proposed neighbourhood plan.

Canal & Rivers Trust

The Canal & River Trust is a statutory consultee under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

The Canal & River Trust is a company limited by guarantee and registered as a charity. It is separate from government but still the recipient of a significant amount of government funding.

The Trust has a range of charitable objects including:

- To hold in trust or own and to operate and manage inland waterways for public benefit, use and enjoyment;
- To protect and conserve objects and buildings of heritage interest;
- To further the conservation, protection and improvement of the natural environment of inland waterways; and
- To promote sustainable development in the vicinity of any inland waterways for the benefit of the public.

Having reviewed the area to be covered by the neighbour area we would like to make the following comments. The proposed neighbourhood area in Castlefield includes waterways within the ownership of the Canal and River Trust. We would therefore like to be kept informed and consulted with as the Neighbourhood plans evolve to ensure that the interests of the Trust as set out above are recognised.

Network Rail

Network Rail is the public owner and operator of Britain's railway infrastructure, which includes the tracks, signals, tunnels, bridges, viaducts, level crossings and stations – the largest of which we also manage. All profits made by the company, including from commercial development, are reinvested directly back into the network.

Network Rail would comment as follows:

(1) Railway Infrastructure

There is a considerable amount of rail infrastructure in the Castlefield Neighbourhood area, and that where possible Network Rail would like the layout and arrangement of space in any new development(s) to be designed so that it makes the most of the spaces beneath the viaduct, in terms of commercial uses. Ideally the arch spaces would front onto open public space and areas that create new footfall, rather than being "back of house". This will create interest and vibrancy, and small business opportunities.

Servicing of commercial arch space will need to be factored in, together with maintenance access to the viaducts.

(2) Asset Protection

Network Rail would request that the Castlefield Neighbourhood Area group should contact Network Rail for any proposals within the area to ensure that:

(a) Access points / rights of way belonging to Network Rail are not impacted by developments within the area.

(b) That any proposal does not impact upon the railway infrastructure / Network Rail land e.g.

- Drainage works / water features
- Encroachment of land or air-space
- Excavation works
- Siting of structures/buildings less than 2m from the Network Rail boundary / Party Wall Act issues
- Lighting impacting upon train drivers ability to perceive signals
- Landscaping that could impact upon overhead lines or Network Rail boundary treatments
- Any piling works
- Any scaffolding works
- Any public open spaces and proposals where minors and young children may be likely to use a site which could result in trespass upon the railway (which we would remind the council is a criminal offence under s55 British Transport Commission Act 1949)
- Any use of crane or plant
- Any fencing works
- Any demolition works
- Any hard standing areas
- Any tunnels in the plan area

We would request that the Castlefield Neighbourhood Area authority / group when submitting proposals for a development contact Network Rail's Town Planning Team and include a location plan and a description of the works taking place for review and comment.

All initial proposals and plans should be flagged up to the Network Rail Town Planning Team London North Western Route at the following address:

In addition to the comments already submitted we would add that the Northern Hub scheme will impact the proposal area as this will change the structure and alignment of the existing railway viaduct creating potentially a number of new opportunities for commercial space in the arches which will both serve the needs of the local communities, encourage increased footfall and create new employment activity.

Any new development needs to respect the listed status of the railway viaduct and enable the use of the space to be maximised. Provision needs to be made for servicing, deliveries and car parking in the design of any scheme.

Sport England

Planning Policy in the National Planning Policy Framework identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays

an important part in this process and providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type and in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means positive planning for sport, protection from unnecessary loss of sports facilities and an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land and community facilities provision is important.

It is important therefore that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects national policy for sport as set out in the above document with particular reference to Parts 73 and 74 to ensure proposals comply with National Planning Policy. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing fields (see link below), as set out in our national guide, 'A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England – Planning Policy Statement'.
<http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/development-management/planning-applications/playing-field-land/>

Sport England provides guidance on developing policy for sport and further information can be found following the link below:

<http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/>

Sport England works with Local Authorities to ensure Local Plan policy is underpinned by robust and up to date assessments and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports delivery. If local authorities have prepared a Playing Pitch Strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports strategy it will be important that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects the recommendations set out in that document and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support the delivery of those recommendations.

<http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/>

If new sports facilities are being proposed Sport England recommend you ensure such facilities are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.

<http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/>



CASTLEFIELD

Preserving, improving, living -
in the heart of our city



Boundary Supporting Statement

Castlefield Neighbourhood Area Application

Castlefield Forum

January 2016

Ref: CNP.2016.001a

Castlefield Forum
Castlefield
Manchester

Email: castlefieldforum@gmail.com

www.ourcastlefield.co.uk

Castlefield Forum


Castlefield Neighbourhood Area Application

Boundary Supporting Statement

January 2016

Ref: CNP.2016.001a

Authorised for and on behalf of Castlefield Forum

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M Dixon', on a light blue background.

Matthew Dixon
Neighbourhood Plan Action Group Leader

This report takes into account the particular requirements of the Castlefield Forum. It is not intended for and should not be relied upon by any third party. Any such party relies on this report at their own risk.

castlefieldforum@gmail.com

© Report copyright of Castlefield Forum.

Castlefield Neighbourhood Area Application
Boundary Supporting Statement



Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. BOUNDARY APPLICATION	1
1.2. NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA APPLICATION DOCUMENTS	1
2. THE PROPOSED BOUNDARY	2
2.1. PROCEDURE	2
2.2. INITIAL BOUNDARY CONSIDERATION	2
2.3. PHYSICAL FEATURES	3
3. CONSULTATION	5
3.1. FORUM SUPPORT	5
3.2. PUBLIC CONSULTATION	5
3.3. POST-CONSULTATION DECISIONS	6
4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.....	8

Figures

Figure 1.0 – Neighbourhood Area

Figure 2.0 – Conservation Areas

Figure 2.1 – Physical Features

Figure 3.0 – Consultation Venues

Appendix A

Castlefield Boundary Consultation Poster



1. Introduction

1.1. Boundary Application

1.1.1. This boundary supporting statement accompanies a neighbourhood area application to Manchester City Council (MCC) by Castlefield Forum.

1.1.2. The neighbourhood area application is for the:

Designation of a neighbourhood area to be known as 'Castlefield Neighbourhood Area' administered by the Castlefield Forum

1.1.3. The neighbourhood area boundary shown in *Figure 1.0* identifies the area to be covered by the neighbourhood development plan.

1.1.4. The purpose of the neighbourhood area boundary is to provide a designated area, which a neighbourhood development plan will relate to upon its submission.


1.1.5. The neighbourhood area application is being made in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, 61G (1) and Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Regulation 5.

1.1.6. A separate forum supporting statement is to be submitted with this application to demonstrate that the Castlefield Forum is capable of becoming the designated neighbourhood forum for the neighbourhood area being applied for.

1.2. Neighbourhood Area Application Documents

1.2.1. The neighbourhood area application comprises the following documents:

- Application Form
- CNP.2016.001a Boundary Supporting Statement
- CNP.2016.002a Forum Supporting Statement
- Neighbourhood Area Boundary – Ref: CNP.2015.006a



Key
 Proposed Neighbourhood Area
 Greater Manchester LPAs



Email: castlefieldforum@gmail.com
www.ourcastlefield.co.uk

Client	Castlefield Forum		
Project	Neighbourhood Area Boundary Application		
Title	Figure 1.0 Neighbourhood Area		
Scale	1:5,000 at A3	Drawn	Checked
		MD	MD
		Date	Date
		06/11/15	06/11/15
Authorised	CM	Date	06/11/15
Drawing Number	CNP.2015.006a		



2. The Proposed Boundary

2.1. Procedure

- 2.1.1. The proposed neighbourhood area boundary has been given proper consideration in accordance with relevant legislation and guidance.
- 2.1.2. The specified area does not include the whole or any part of the area of a parish council in accordance with 61G(3)(b) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 2.1.3. Paragraph 033 of the National Planning Practice Guidance 'NPPG' ref: 41-033-20140306¹, has been followed as guidance to support the boundary decision making process. Additional, guidance has been sought from the Neighbourhood Plans Roadmap Guide provided by 'Locality' a national network of community-led organisations².

2.2. Initial Boundary Consideration


- 2.2.1. The proposed neighbourhood area boundary is within a city centre location and consequently does not have clear settlement boundaries to use as a starting point.
- 2.2.2. To determine the base position for the boundary and following relevant guidance from the NPPG (Para 033), the Conservation Areas for Castlefield and St John Street were used to provide the initial area (See *Figure 2.0*). The Castlefield Conservation Area was designated on 13th October 1979³ by MCC with St John Street Conservation Area designated on 4th November 1970⁴.
- 2.2.3. The Conservation Areas were used as these had previously been designated by MCC for their distinctive features, with these areas having a historical and physical connection based on land use and building type. Seeking to reflect these two areas and not to isolate parts of Castlefield and St Johns Street which were considered contiguous, we established a boundary including the whole of the two areas.

¹<http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/neighbourhood-planning/designating-a-neighbourhood-area/>

² locality.org.uk/about/

³ http://www.manchester.gov.uk/info/511/conservation_areas/972/castlefield_conservation_area

⁴ http://www.manchester.gov.uk/info/511/conservation_areas/914/st_john_street_conservation_area



- Key**
- Proposed Neighbourhood Area
 - Greater Manchester LPAs
- Conservation Areas**
- Castlefield
 - St John Street



Email: castlefieldforum@gmail.com
www.ourcastlefield.co.uk

Relevant Body	Castlefield Forum		
Project	Neighbourhood Area Boundary Application		
Title	Figure 2.0 Conservation Areas		
Scale	1:5,000 at A3	Drawn MD Date 03/09/15	Checked MD Date 03/09/15
		Authorised CM Date 03/09/15	
Drawing Number	CNP.2015.002a		



2.2.4. Developing the boundary from this position, the NPPG guidance to include areas where a formal or informal network of community based groups operate at paragraph 034 was followed in relation to areas covered by the following:

- Castlefield Forum
- St Johns Street Residents Group
- Britannia Mills Residents Group

2.2.5. The Castlefield Forum is open to and has members from the entirety of the proposed neighbourhood area boundary including:

- West of the Mancunian Way 'A57(M)' either side of Ellesmere Street
- Castlefield Basin
- Deansgate Quay and north of River Medlock
- Potato Wharf
- Liverpool Road
- St Johns Street and Gardens

2.3. Physical Features


2.3.1. To define the boundary, strong infrastructure, physical and local planning authority boundaries were used, as the NPPG (Para 033) outlines these as a useful mechanism to create a clear boundary. *Figure 2.1* identifies the main physical features discussed in this sub-section.


2.3.2. The River Irwell was used as the western boundary as it serves a similar process defining both Salford and Manchester and rivers have been used as clear boundaries for towns, cities and countries over the centuries.

2.3.3. As the boundary reaches the most westerly point, the local planning authority boundary between Trafford and Manchester was used which also followed key built infrastructure of the railway. The railway acts as a clear boundary ensuring those residents and businesses within this section of the plan area are not left isolated.

2.3.4. The southern boundary is defined by Chester Road 'A56' a major arterial route into the City Centre. The Chester Road roundabout is followed along the closest edge to Castlefield to be in accordance with the Conservation Area and to use it as a physical barrier.

2.3.5. The eastern boundary is defined by Deansgate Road 'A56' one of the main roads through the northern end of the city centre. Deansgate acts as a strong physical barrier where development beyond does not relate to the Castlefield area. To the north east the boundary comes away from Deansgate Road to align with the St






CASTLEFIELD
Preserving, Improving, Living –
in the heart of our city

Key

- Proposed Neighbourhood Area
- Greater Manchester LPAs

Physical Features

- 1** River Inwell
- 2** Railway / LPA Boundary
- 3** 'A56' Chester Road
- 4** 'A56' Deansgate Road
- 5** 'A34' Quay Street
- A** Deansgate Quay



CASTLEFIELD
Preserving, Improving, Living –
in the heart of our city

Email: castlefieldforum@gmail.com
www.ourcastlefield.co.uk

Client: Castlefield Forum

Project: Neighbourhood Area Boundary Application

Title: Figure 2.1
Physical Features

Scale	Drawn	Checked	Authorised
1:5,000 at A3	MD	MD	CM
	Date	Date	Date
	28/12/15	28/12/15	28/12/15

Drawing Number: CNP.2015.007a



Johns Street Conservation Area to keep the physical appearance and characteristic of the neighbourhood in a consistent style.

- 2.3.6. The northern boundary is defined by Quay Street 'A34' which becomes New Quay Street 'A34' as it crosses the River Irwell from Manchester into Salford. Using these roads as a continuous boundary aligns with the Castlefield and St Johns Street Conservation Areas and provides a clear boundary along another key route into the city centre.
- 2.3.7. The nature of Castlefield and its history as the birthplace of modern industry has left a legacy of major infrastructure within the boundary. The strategic infrastructure routes such as the canal network, currently used rail network and the Mancunian Way 'A57(M)' are not to be a part of this neighbourhood plan.




3. Consultation

3.1. Forum Support

- 3.1.1. Upon receiving unanimous support at a Full Forum vote in November 2014 on whether to proceed with the Neighbourhood Plan we began a comprehensive consultation process.
- 3.1.2. To establish the initial boundary for the reasons set out in *Section 2*, each amendment to the boundary was first consulted upon by the Neighbourhood Plan Action Group to be followed by the committee and Full Forum where considered necessary.
- 3.1.3. The process of establishing the initial boundary took several months to ensure all those engaged with the process had the opportunity to make comment and for the Forum to vote on important boundary amendments. Once the consultation version of the boundary had been agreed upon we arranged a series of consultation events.

3.2. Public Consultation

- 3.2.1. The consultation events all took place in September 2015 and were open to businesses/people who work in or near to the area, residents and elected members of the Council. The following locations, shown on *Figure 3.0* for the consultation events were selected to ensure that interested parties located in the three areas within the boundary would all have an opportunity to comment:
 - The Banyan Tree, Ellesmere Street - Wednesday 16th September
 - The Wharf, Castlefield Basin - Thursday 24th September
 - The Castlefield Hotel, Liverpool Road - Wednesday 30th September
- 3.2.2. The consultation events were arranged to follow on three consecutive weeks and on different nights to ensure those who wished to attend would have the best chance of doing so.
- 3.2.3. To support the consultation event, posters (Appendix A) were put up in residential apartment blocks, community locations (gyms, bars, restaurants, cafes, pubs and the MOSI) and electronic copies were made available via the website and published on Facebook and Twitter.



Key
 Proposed Neighbourhood Area
 Greater Manchester LPAs



Email: castlefieldforum@gmail.com
www.ourcastlefield.co.uk

Client	Castlefield Forum		
Project	Neighbourhood Area Boundary Application		
Title	Figure 3.0 Consultation Venues		
Scale	1:5,000 at A3	Drawn MD Date 28/12/15	Checked MD Date 28/12/15
		Authorised CM Date 28/12/15	
Drawing Number	CNP.2015.008a		



- 3.2.4. The key question for the consultation was to address ‘Where is Castlefield?’ in the context of bringing forward a neighbourhood plan. Attendees of the consultation events had the opportunity to set out whether they identify with Castlefield and the boundary put forward to cover its neighbourhood area or the adjacent neighbourhood.
- 3.2.5. This question was particularly pertinent for the Ellesmere Street section to ascertain whether they associated with Castlefield or Hulme across Chester Road. The Banyan Tree provided the ideal location to reach those in this area.
- 3.2.6. Attendees included businesses, residents and elected members. Residents represented the local area and community groups active in the area but attendees also came from other areas within the boundary who were unable to attend consultation events located nearer to them. Unanimous support was provided to the neighbourhood plan process and the proposed boundary
- 3.2.7. It was also important to establish whether residents of St John’s Street Conservation Area associated with the neighbourhood area. St John’s residents and members of the Forum group have been involved in the process of establishing the boundary from the initial stages and have supported the process. However, the views of residents were also sought.
- 3.2.8. The three consultation events received unanimous support to the principle of the Castlefield Forum bringing forward a Neighbourhood Plan for the area. Comments were received on the initial boundary, however no resident, business or Council member suggested a reduction.

3.3. Post-Consultation Decisions

- 3.3.1. The revised boundary options incorporating the comments received at the consultation process were considered at a Committee meeting on 2nd November 2015. A decision was taken that the amendment to include the area to the north of River Medlock, east of Chester Road ‘A56’, west of Medlock Street ‘A5103’ and south of Deansgate rail station should be taken forward.
- 3.3.2. Deansgate Quay (Letter A on *Figure 2.1*) and the portion of land north of the River Medlock, has the river as its southern boundary. The River Medlock provides a clear physical boundary and development beyond the River Medlock to the south does not have a connection to Castlefield currently. The east of Deansgate Quay is bounded by the Medlock Street ‘A5103’ another arterial route into the city centre. The northern boundary is defined by the railway arches a key piece of infrastructure. The area is also identified as a part of Castlefield within the draft

Castlefield Neighbourhood Area Application
Boundary Supporting Statement



Strategic Plan for Manchester City Centre: 2015-18⁵, whilst this is a supporting planning document it outlines the relationship between the areas.

- 3.3.3. The proposed neighbourhood area included a significant amendment and was therefore taken to the Castlefield Forum meeting following the AGM on 12th November 2015. The revised boundary received unanimous support to become the final boundary for the neighbourhood area.

5

www.manchester.gov.uk/info/200024/consultations_and_surveys/7084/give_us_your_views_on_our_plan_for_the_future_of_the_city_centre



4. Summary and Conclusion

- 4.1.1. The boundary has sought to ensure that no areas either currently developed or with the potential to be developed for future residential or business use are left isolated. The boundary has sought the views of local residents, businesses and members obtaining 100% support for the neighbourhood area. Ensuring that no future residents are left isolated will create a more cohesive community in the future considering the term of a Neighbourhood Plan and in accordance with Planning Advisory Service (PAS) guidance⁶.
- 4.1.2. We believe that the boundary proposed reflects the local residents, businesses and committee members who make up this area of the city whilst acknowledging the physical and historical properties which define it.

⁶ LGA / PAS: March 2015 Briefing Note: Neighbourhood Area and Neighbourhood Forum Designations

Appendix A



Where is Castlefield?

Castlefield Forum is bringing forward a Neighbourhood Plan and needs your help to define its boundary. It is the first time residents and businesses alike can have their say on the area which defines where they come from.

Where is Castlefield — Only You Know



Come along to any of the three consultation events taking place at well known venues within Castlefield. We will be there with the proposed boundary and associated plans to answer any questions.



The Banyan Tree

Wednesday 16th September
2015

18:00—19:30



The Wharf

Thursday 24th September
2015

18:00—19:30



The Castlefield Hotel

Wednesday 30th September
2015

18:00—19:30

www.ourcastlefield.co.uk

Email: castlefieldforum@gmail.com



<https://www.facebook.com/groups/ourcastlefield/>



Twitter: @ourcastlefield