

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 25th September 2013

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

13/2704M

LOCATION

Wilkin Farm, 77 Moss Lane, Styal

UPDATE PREPARED

23 September 2013

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

In response to the recommendation of refusal of the application additional information has been submitted, details of which can be read on file. A list of the information submitted is provided below with a summary of the points made/case presented in support of the application:

- *'Addendum to the Planning Statement'*
 - *'Passenger Check-In Times'*
 - *'Study of Airport Parking Operators'*
 - *'Manchester Airport – Surface Access and Parking' (Extract from report)*
 - *'Shell Carrington Site' (Sales Extract)*
 - *'Committee Report – Manchester City Council Planning & Highways Dept'*
- i) Reference is made to what is referred to as para. 111 of the NPPF. This seems to be an error and the para. being referred to should be para. 90. This allows for certain forms of development in the Green Belt as being appropriate development, so long as they preserve openness. One of these is “...*local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location...*” Hence, the applicant’s agent concludes that the proposed development (seasonal overflow long-stay airport parking) is an appropriate form of development in the Green Belt.
- ii) The following claims are made, stating these are the reasons why airport parking is needed in the Green Belt. Many of these aspects are presented as constituting very special circumstances: a) the last audit undertaken by Manchester Airport (2001) indentified provision of 27800 long-stay parking spaces (on and off site) and the predicted requirement was between 39500 and 53800 spaces – hence, a shortfall of 26000; b) the peak check-in times are between

03.00 and 07.00 and the only logistical, economically viable option for passengers getting to/from the airport in time is long-stay car parks close to the airport; c) the Local Plan is out of date; d) the Airport has undergone, and is still undergoing, significant development (eg. 'Airport City'), which has contributed to the removal of existing Airport parking provision and increases future demand; e) Manchester Airport is working towards a detailed car parking strategy but this isn't finalised and there is an immediate need for spaces to meet demand; f) long-stay car parking close to the Airport is sustainable/meets sustainable objectives; g) there is currently 16052 airport parking spaces available (August 2009) and provision of spaces has dropped within the area since 2007; h) provision of such parking supports the Airport's objective of economic development; i) the 'Shell Carrington' site, which has had 9000 spaces on it is to be sold as a 'mixed development site' (employment and housing); j) an application by Manchester Airport for 9000 long-stay surface car parking spaces has been recommended for refusal by Wythenshaw Area Committee (this goes to the Planning Committee in October and even if approved would not be available for use for another 2.5 years); k) there is a lack of alternative sites within the Airport Operational Area; l) the proposed development is for seasonal overflow to support established sites.

NB. It is noted that the applicant intends providing a '*Transport Statement*' prior to the Committee meeting on 25.09.2013. Should this be submitted in time it is intended that the information will be considered via consultation with the Strategic Highways Manager and a verbal up-date will be provided at Committee.

CONSULTATIONS

Manchester Airport:

Having considered the additional information Manchester Airport maintains its objection. In summary, the reasons given are as follows:

- The policy case is confusing in that the claim made is that the proposed is appropriate development in the Green Belt, but a case for very special circumstances is presented.
- The 'requirement' for such parking in the Green Belt is based on the claim that the Airport is in the Green Belt. However, it isn't.
- It is claimed that the proposed development supports the economic objective of developing Airport business. However, there is no commercial or economic benefit directly attributed to the Airport from the development.
- The case presented for under-provision of long-stay Airport parking is limited and a case for lack of alternative sites or actual need has not been substantiated.

- The case presented is based on a gross car park space projection produced by the Airport based on annual passage numbers (40 million). This approach is too simplistic. Current passenger numbers are around 20 million.
- Alternative sites have been inadequately assessed. Sites that are not in use but can lawfully be brought into use. Loss of parking at the Airport that would occur over the next 4 years, and phased, will not be addressed via a temporary permission of 3 years on the application site.
- The application by the Airport has not yet been determined and it is noted that the site is an allocated site outside of the Green Belt.
- The proposed development would not support the Airport's ability to encourage a mode-share shift and deliver its Surface Access Strategy.

OFFICER APPRAISAL

It is asserted by the applicant that the proposed development constitutes 'local transport infrastructure'. It is noted that this term is not defined in the NPPF Glossary. It is questionable whether a temporary seasonal off-airport car parking area should be classed as such. However, even if it was considered to constitute local transport infrastructure it is noted in the Committee report (and repeated here) that para. 90 of the NPPF allows for certain forms of development in the Green Belt so long as they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. As concluded in the committee report, and again here, it is considered that the proposed development does not preserve the openness of the Green Belt and would conflict with one of the purposes of including land within it due to encroachment. Hence, the proposed development is considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

The claims made in respect of: the extent of long-stay parking provision required; the current long-stay parking provision; the demand for such parking provision; and land availability for such development do not stand up to scrutiny. It is considered that figures used have been drawn upon selectively and the methodology used and analysis undertaken has not been robust (e.g. the projected 40 million passages at the Airport as the basis for much of the claims; a superficial assessment of provision and demand; presumptions about current planning applications and future development on certain sites).

Hence, bearing the above in mind it is considered that the additional information, along with the information originally submitted, does not demonstrate that there is a need for the proposed development to be located in the Green Belt. Furthermore, any considerations in favour of the proposal do not carry sufficient weight to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. Very special circumstances have not been demonstrated to justify allowing the development.

CONCLUSIONS

The additional information submitted has been considered and the '*Transport Statement*' is awaited. However, subject to outstanding consultations, the recommendation of refusal is unchanged.